SUPREME COURT, U.S.
FILED

NO. ___ 051105 JAN 27 2006

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jeffrey Alan Olson
Petitioner,

v.

Gerald O. Williams (Attorney); United States Senate; United States Congress; & Honorable Judge Paul Magnuson);
Respondents

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jeffrey Alan Olson, pro se, 380 Bert Street, P.O. Box 536, Lake Crystal, Minnesota, 56055 Phone (507) 726-2678
for Petitioner.

April 15, 2006

The Plaintiff is asking the Court to consider the following questions, and for the protection's of such rights.

1. Is it Constitutional for a state court to have executive appointment powers in appointing guardian ad litems?

2. Is it Constitutional for a federal judge to deny rights to file cases to a citizen of the United States?

3. Is it Constitutional for a judge to disregard parental visitation rights without just cause & not remove themselves from a case where they are a defendant of the case, for Order of the case?

4. Is it Constitutional to be appointed by a jury of judges when a bench has not been filled for political reasons after Ninety days? If so what should be the criteria?

5. Is it Constitutional for a judge to be appointed by the president of the United States if the judicial branch is to be separate but equal?

6. Is it Constitutional to view foreign courts opinions on similiar cases or does this violate stari decisis?

7. Is the (3) felony conviction law Constitutional in specifics or does a felony have to broad of conviction, that rather than its intended fish bowl effect, it encompasses an ocean, and crimes are not equally due this sentence? If it is found to be unconstitutional, how should the convicted be waivered?

8. Is it Constitutional for a guardian ad litem to direct all proceedings involving medical expert witnesses?

9. Should opposing party and their attorney be held to account for damages to a party when jurisdiction was not properly obtained, which resulted in the loss of the other parties career, & visitation of children is denied for an extended period of time without just cause?

10. Should a judge have lawful

power to deny the right to the Soldiers and Sailors Act, & deny visitation of a parent in service to the country's defense?

11. Should custody of children be broken down into six year segments; which both promote the opportunity to be the primary caregiver as well as afford the opportunity for career and allow for college and vocational training?

8. Are lawfirms taking away from the ethical act of equality or even the right to a fair trial; when the other party is pro se? Should lawfirms be desolved because of this unequal balance or limited to specific allowable numbers and to only persons with a five year window after passing the bar?

9. Are the ethical boundries achieved when a judge can return to practicing as an attorney and the two clearly different responsibilities are never given true ethical seperation?

10. Should there be an organized set time limit for each case based on its crime or civil matter of law, which better organizes and allows for equal court time by all people? Should this responsibility be governed by the Supreme Court of the United States and reaffirmed every five years?

11. Should a judge be allowed the right to remove a witness if the line of questioning is out of line or not applicable to the case after ten questions?

12. Should a judge be allowed to ask at least five questions to defend or in favor of the defendant; and five questions to convict or in favor of the plaintiff, after the jury cannot come to a decision after three hours and there after be known as the ten questions of doubt?

13. Should a defendant be allowed the right to take the stand and have the

ten questions of doubt applied toward their appeal after a verdict of guilty?

14. Should the defendant lose his or her right to an appeal if they chose not to take the stand and face the ten questions of doubt, and be ordered to pay the debt, or face death, if the death penalty is so awarded without lost time or humiliation?

15. Define the reasoning behind or against adding judges to the Supreme Court of the United States?

16. Should rules be put into a hand out for all persons acting pro se, to effectively tell them the proceedures and rules especially governing mandates (like the one made available by this court)?

17. Should all law library's be opened to the public if state or federally funded and have signes posted where they are to be located at in the court?

18. Please define visitation right's? Please clearly define the responsibilities and penalties against a state for denying these rights for unlawfull reasons, without just cause?

19. Can the Guardian Ad Litem be held for damages when they refuse to apply the laws for visitation and its being denied?

20. Should the allowable time to sue be extended longer than its current state of limitations?

21. Should a state or county lose its right to practice law for a minimum of one year if it knowingly disregards the rights of people on a mass proportion based on gender, ethnic background, race, or social status, where court room policy dictates its open disregard for these rights at the state and county level, & sanctions be imposed upon sitting judges as in loss of wages?

22. Should attorney's fees be awarded

to a parties attorney who has not achieved jurisdiction in good faith?

23. If opposing party is seeking attorney's fees should a monthly statement be sent to the other party notifying them of the current total for attorney's fees?

24. Should visitation facilities be made to hold an equal gender balance within their staff to promote equality, and to discontinue gender conflict's such as restrooms?

25. Should rules for serving opposing persons be put in writting in public view of the clerk of court's public reception point?

26. Should person's serving in the military have all court proceedings heard with in the state they are currently serving or based at the time of filing?

27. Should United States Presidential Insurance be made Costitutional under new IIRS. tax formula?

28. Should the United States Congress & Senate have restrictions placed upon voting themselves raises?

29. Should United States Judge Marshals be established to insure executive oversight and protections of americans rights?

30. Should attorneys and Doctors be subject to: one year out of seven, be subject to serving under restrictions to serve Americans unable to pay fees?

(b) LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING IN THE COURT WHOSE JUDGMENT IS SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED: Petitioner (Jeffrey A. Olson); Respondents (Paula M. Zamzow); attorney (Gerald O. Williams Jr.); Lawfirm of attorney (Kissoon, Clugg,Linder & Ditberner); the state of Minnesota; Judge David M. Duffy; Bonnie Ellingboe, MA Licensed Psychologist; McCullough, Smith & Kempe P.A. Attorneys at Law; Jackie Cardinal-Guardian ad Litem; Susan Olson-Guardian ad Litem; Kay Kraus Guardian ad Litem Coordinator; Honorable Judge Bruce A. Peterson; Referee Jeannice M. Reding; Gerald O. Williams attorney At Law; State of Minnesota Honorable Chief Judge Kevin S. Burke, Honorable Chief Judge Kathleen Blatz; United States District Court Honorable Chief Judge James M. Rosenbaum, Honorable Chief Judge William H. Rehnquest; United States Senate; United States Congress; Honorable Judge Paul Magnuson; Honorable Judge Daniel Mabley; Office of the Governor of the state of Minnesota; Office of the President of the United States;

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Cover	i
Questions	ii-v
List Of Parties	vi
Table of Contents	vi
Citations	vii
Basis of Jurisdiction	vii
Constitutional Provisions	viii
Consise Statement	1a
Direct and Consise Argument	5a
Claim for Damages	1b
Appendedex	1

(d) Citations of The Official and Unofficial Reports of the Opinions and Orders:

(1) 7-29-98 Duffy, Hearing, Hennepin.
(2) 2-22-99 Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist.
(3) 4-15-99 Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist.
(4) 2-16-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(5) 5-10-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(6) 7-27-00, Magnunson, Order, U.S.Dist.
(7) 12=7-00, Order of Beam, Fagg, & Loken.
(8) 3-5-01, Writ of Cert. filed.
(9) 1-26-01, Order Dir. of Court.
(10) 12-29-03, Peterson Order Henn.
(11) Dec-03, Ellingboe Opinion.
(12) 01-30-4, Order Judge Burke.
(13) 03-2-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(14) 04-28-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(15) 05-28-04, Reding-Peterson Order.
(16) 06-10-04, Peterson Order.
(17) 09-10-04, Opinion Guardian.
(18) 09-10-04, Opinion Guardian.
(19) 06-24-04, Magnuson Order.
(20) 09-1-04, Court Ord. Psch. Eval.
(21) 10-19-04, Peterson Order.
(22) 12-10-04, Opinion report Guardian.
(23) 12-28-04, Order Dir. C. Sletten/Duda
(24) 02-9-05, Letter Guardian.
(25) 01-15-05, Order Dir. of Court.
(26) 05-09-05, Dir. of Court
(27) 07-31-05, Guardian Report.
(28) 09-2-05, Mabley Order.
(29) 02-02-05, Order Davis.
(30) 10-20-05, Bye, Mcmillion, & Riley.
(31) 12-22-05 Order Dir. Of Court.
(32) 01-20-06 Order Dir. of Court.

(e) STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT IS AS FOLLOWS:

(i) Judgment is sought to be reviewed in case 05-1615 Olson vs. Williams Filed: December 22, 2005, from the Eighth District Court of Appeals. The Appeals court has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power.

(iii) The docket fee will be included as a money order located in the U.S. Express box. Plaintiff will serve defendants as is understood by the question and inform them of writ via county sheriffs department & or Certified Mail.

(iv) The statutory provision which confers on this court jurisdiction are as follows: [Fed. R. Civ. P. 35, 52, & 59; 28 U.S.C. & 1254; Lr 24.1; 28 U.S.C 2403 Article I, II, & III Amendment I, IV, VIII, IX, X, & XIV. (Procedure for notification of any claim of UnConstitutionality).

(v) The notifications will be made to the department of justice at or before the time of service.

(f)

(1) Soldiers' & Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, an act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval establishments, including the Coast Guard. 50 U.S.C. Appendex 501 et seq,; stat. 1178 (1940) as subsequently amended.

(2) Qualifications of visitation and custody.

(3) JURISDICTION:

Summary of jurisdictional law: initial determinations and modifications.

(g) That this case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellative practice and to require immediate determination in this court as in U.S.C. & 2101 though appellate proceedings are met. The Eighth circuit Court also believed that the Respondent would never persue his rights in the upper court. The state of Minnesota took jurisdiction with out meeting statutory guidelines in the state court, & never cared what the result or consequences of their actions displayed in court

would be. Since taking jurisdiction the actions of the courts both state and federal but more state; has been a cooperative effort to degrade, humiliate & provoke an uncivilized display which could then be actionable against Mr. Olson.

(i) The Respondent let the attorney whom he hired, to argue jurisdiction and move the case back to California, but he failed and was dismissed of his duties. The Respondent then argued the case pro se and moved upon the court that jurisdiction would continue to be an issue, because Mr. Olson lost his career and was not receiving visitation. The court assumed jurisdiction anyways and proceedings continued and Mr. Olson was deneid his rights and harrassed from that point forward.

Federal questions of Constitutional rights were raised in every hearing in front of the court, & listed in the appendex. But no action or protection of rights has ever been acted upon by judicial officers sworn to uphold the United States or Minnesota Constitution.

CONSISE STATEMENT:

This case was brought to the state of Minnesota from the state of California under false affidavits by the Petitioner in the dissolution case 216900. The Honorable Judge Duffy suppressed evidence at trial, that Ms. Zamzow held a valid California Drivers license. The Honorable Judge Duffy also mocked the evidence and mislead the argument by characterizing the auto insurance report verifying Ms. Zamzow's California license as an "application for a license" in his Order. The Honorable Judge Duffy went to great extent for reason's unknown, to cover up the residency of Ms. Zamzow. But Judge Duffy gave no care to the display of impropriety's; to the extent that Ms. Zamzow's Sister "Susan Zamzow," at the time an attorney licensed in Minnesota and Ms. Zamzows' attorney Mr. Williams both appeared coming from the judges chambers together prior to hearings "as a meeting of the minds," on several occasions; during proceedings. Often during proceedings the judge would look in the direction of Ms. Zamzows table and remind them where he would be located at & put this in their Order's. The Guardian ad Litem would secretly talk to Ms. Zamzows attorney and the judge; right in front of everyone. There simply appeared to be no care at all, the state bar and the judge's involved in these state dissolution cases was overwhelming with appearing bias! But this seemed to be a strategy to try to get this plaintiff to be outraged and overreact. Their strategy certainly appeared to try to implement some evidence of their psychological evaluations and get a display of paranoid reaction. But this plaintiff was to disciplined, after all I was a Marine. What struck this Plaintiff the

most was how they didn't seem to have any concept, that what they were doing was wrong and would insight violence if directed at a person without the discipline maintained by this Plaintiff
Aside from this case, when a judge operates family court like this, does it really end there? Does this disregard carry over and embolden the judge to violate rights beyond the civil court? Federal District Court judges see nothing wrong to the extent, their prejudice against the plaintiff for filing such an outrage against a judge. But who is watching the judge in family court? Obviously nobody is, and judge Duffy knows that; it belongs to the states! When asked all federal judges responded; they'll tell you we do not want any part of it, that is a state matter!

Because a lot of lives can be saved, certainly hope this Court takes these violations serious; its a state matter, but the people must have federal supervision. Then, the Honorable judge Duffy and the attorney's would have to watch themselves; because the Constitution says were here to protect the people. Judge Duffy also suppressed evidence where Mrs. Olson had snatched the children from the home in California without Mr. Olson's knowledge and Petitioned the court in Minnesota claiming she was a resident of Minnesota.

The Petitioner Ms. Zamzow had not lived in the state of Minnesota for the required time for residency. Mrs. Olson had brought the minor child for visitation with marks of abuse several times hoping that the Respondent would receive the child without question and upon returning the child, the marks would then be addressed for abuse against the Respondent These police reports were suppressed also by the judge not in favor of (Mr. Olson).

Mr. Olson lost his career in the United States Marine Corps because the court of Minnesota had zero tolerance for accomadating Mr. Olson's service to his country in arranging court hearings and visitation which would have allowed for Mr. Olson's military required duties and deployments, which Mr. Olson had no control over. Mr. & Mrs. Olson were both resident's of the state of California, we both held a valid California drivers license and Mr. Olson petitioned the court in California to adopt his daughter.

Mr. Olson was harrassed and taunted about his Native American heritage. The guardian taunted Mr. Olson in phone conversations. Then when Mr. Olson told her he was writting down everything she was saying, and would fax them to her and the judge; she refused any further faxes.

Mr. Olson was refused several of his right's because he was not allowed to defend himself with in the rules and laws which allow for a person to defend themselves. The state court says the Plaintiff is harrassing the court by documenting his visitation rights and asking for them in letters.

Mr. Olson was refused visitation with out lawful due process. Where the law had not reflected the Order's, because Mr. Olson acted as his own attorney. Mr. Olson refused to drop his right of suit, against the officers of the court, for his loss of career, Mr. Olson's right's were overlooked with total disregard to the laws and rules.

The Plaintiff currently has three additional cases which have been denied without just cause. Plaintiff is sueing to have those cases released and put out for Order with the public's knowledge, along with these additional changes in law with oversight.

The Plaintiff has been brutilized in court accusations by government officials acting for and on behalf of the state of Minnesota in holding up these cases; along with attorney Gerald O. Williams Jr.

Attorney Gerald O. Williams Jr. has continued to ask judges in court hearings to take action against this Plaintiff for sueing Defendant Gerald O. Williams in federal court. Mr. Williams has manipulated the court and fractured judicial proceedings to the point of the purpose of the hearings are more of a linch mob court atmosphere.

Mr. Williams has brought in material's not requested by the court for the sheer purpose of holding up these various cases and denying Mr. Olson visitation with his son.

The oversight in court proceedings by these various judges has not been seen and in some cases has played a part in holding up these cases from being court Ordered. Oversight protections in court proceedings clearly need to reflect more on the protection of the individual citizen and this is not the case in these various proceedings. Access to the court has been denied for years in some cases as it currently is again in Hennipen County. Truely the childs best interest's were not put first and the child has not been able to see his father.

The court accepted the paper's and the following violations of Constitutional rights and Civil Rights Actions for civil attorney malpractice and 1983 occurred, during or at the time of the next hearing and there after being December 29, 2003. Over sight by the United States Senate and The United States Congress did not prevent these violations from occurring, when in fact they should have been.

REQUEST OF ORAL ARGUMENT:

1. I shall waiver my right too oral

argument unless requested by the Court.

DIRECT AND CONSISE ARGUMENT:

1. Custody: Should be reversed to the Appellant for denial of visitation of both children namely Jake Tyler Olson and Mallory Page Zamzow.

a. Griffin v. Van Griffin, 267 N.W.2d 733 (Minn.1978).

b. Clark v. Clark, 346 N.W.2d 383 (Minn. App. 1984).

c. Grein v. Grein, 364 N.W.2d 383 (Minn. 1985).

d. Hunt v. Hunt, 381 N.W.2d 467 (Minn. App. 1986).

2. Compensation for damages in loss of career in the United States Marine Corps because the children were snatched from their home state and the Minnesota court Judge's violated Mr. Olson's right's and lacked jurisdiction.

a. Norsworthy v. Norsworthy, 289 Ark. 479, 713 S.W.2d 452, 455 (1986).

b. Ashburn v. Ashburn, 661 N.E. 2d 39 (Ind. Ct. App. 1996).

c. Paulsen v. Paulsen, 129 Idaho 536, 928 P.2d 40 (1996).

d. Ex Parte Blanton, 463 So.2d 162 (Ala. 1985).

3. Equal justice under the law with oversight protection, with equal representation of taxation with representation: Establishing these protections is crucial to the integrity of the system of justice and government, where attorneys are scripted in proper ethics and the integrity of the rule of law & balance is made with checks to the United States and Congress.

a. Castillo V. U.S., 552 F.2d 1385 C.A.N.M. 1977.

b. Skinner v. Stone, Raskin & Israel, 724F.2D 264 C.A. Vt 1983.

c. Robak V. U.S., 658 f.2d 471 CA. Ill. 1981.

d. Aretz v. U.S., 604F.2d 417

decision reinstated 660 f.2d 531, C.A. G.A. 1979.

4. Compensation for damages in loss of parenting time with minor children. The loss of parenting time could never be replaced with money, but it is the only way administered under law for Constitutional Rights.

a. Fall v. Indiana University Bd. of Trustees, 33 f. Supp. 2d 729 N.D. Ind. 1998.

b. Fillmore v. Ordonez, 829 F. Supp. 1544, affirmed 17 F.3d 1436. D.

c. Comfort v. Town of Pittsfield, 924 F. Supp. 1219 D.Me. 1996.

d. Lewis v. Goodie, 798 F. Supp. 382 W.D. La. 1992.

ARGUMENT AND APPLICABLE STANDARD OF REVIEW:

or

CONSIDERATIONS FOR CHANGE IN LAW:

1. To be treated equally having equal time in court as everyone else by a standard system.

a. A system of justice which sets time limits upon the trial by catagory subject matter; such as a murder trial shall be limited to ten days or the hours contained in a ten day court hearing (five days for the prosecution or plaintiff in civil and five days for the defense or defendants.

b. The prosecution and defense shall limit their witnesses to the most valued.

c. The United States Supreme Court shall set up the standard system of time limits.

d. This shall ensure an adequate court calender, promote equal justice, put less burden upon the court system, long drawn out trials overwhelm juries and time limits promote attentive attorney's where the burden again lies upon the attorney's to prove their case in a respectable manner, it allows for

a much more consistant case to look at when it is appealed, not burdening taxpayers with unprepared cases and releasing the brakes on the wheels of justice.

2. To have a judge who is not having conflicts with judgments and Orders because they anticipate political or other reprocussions if they rule on the case, where they should be free from political implications.

a. The federal district court judges should be appointed by a three judge panel or jury of their peers.

b. The panel is to be federal appellate judges.

c. They shall have thirty days to review the applications and meet for the last day together interviewing if necessary the final three applicants selected.

d. The final selection shall be made fourteen days after the interview and the judge shall be appointed within sixety days to the bench, ready to serve the people.

3. Having a fair jury trial where more of a chance is given to convict guilty person's and setting free innocent persons wrongfully accused.

a. After a person has been found guilty by a jury a person shall have the right to be asked the ten questions of doubt to accompany the appeal.

b. The ten questions shall be direct questions asked by the judge placing the person with the crime.

4. That a office be made for investigating negligence of state judge benches, where violations of civil rights, statutes, parental rights, Constitutional rights and all other specifically adopted and put into law to protect citizens from improper rulings are enforced, where a judge knowingly violates a citizens rights

and the citizen has neither the education or the monitary fees to persue application or defend themselves in a civil or criminal court with in the court system.

a. That this office falls under the United States attorney Generals office.

b. That the Judge Marshall may stop a case, and assign a new judge to a case after reviewing evidence.

c. The Judge Marshall has access to all areas of the proceedings and may sit in on all cases.

d. The Judge Marshall shall utilize a system of fines imposed upon the state and the states judicial payroll as well as retirement depending upon the severity of the act.

e. The Judge Marshall also may pull an attorney's license to practice law and impose sanctions against the attorney, law firm, public defender, and prosecutor for violation of individual right's.

f. The Judge Marshalls office shall be available to all citizens, for statements and charges.

g. All fines will be argued in front of an agreeable arbitrator.

h. The Judge Marshall shall file with the federal court all inadequate and or questionable laws of the states which violate citizens rights, the United States Constitution, statutes, Congressional laws, and treaties which he comes into contact with or statements and charges addressing these violations.

i. The Judge Marshalls office is to be shared and staffed by civialian lawyers, United States Marine Corps lawyers, and United States Marines sworn to protect the United States Constitution and shall be utilized in times of Marshall Law.

5. Parental rights:
Having an equal chance to parent

and start and or maintain a career is essential. As a society we have to overcome the differences associated with parenting and working as a set gender status for life. To break these barriors we must impose a six year custody term for each parent. It far more helps the mother start her career as well as gives the father his opportunity to be the care giver. We cannot say a female can do a job and hold down a career as well as a male and then say that a difference exists for a father to be a caregiver to a child and that is set aside for females. You have to break this area of gender steareo typing, if true equallity is ever to be achieved!

a. Parental visitation will be established with-in sixety days from petition for dissolution or seperation.

b. Supervised Visitation: shall be warrented only when the child has been sexually abused, or physically abused, and the parent is found guilty in a criminal trial.

c. Supervised pick up and drop off points of the child: shall be warrented only when the custodial parent has been physically abused by police report, not allegation, testimony by the parent or secondary party.

d. Supervised visitation shall be maintained by the county sherriff's department.

e. Dissolution civil proceeding's shall consist of the following: 1a. Division of marital assetts and debt equally.

2a. Custodial rights to the children to be divided equally or every six years; the custody of the child is to change to the other parent (to promote equal love, maintenance, parenting, and responsibility in the eyes of the child). During the non-custodial parenting years,

the non-custodial parent is to have no less than one-third of the time with the child outside of the six to seven hours the child is in school and the eight hours of sleep per day, based on the whole year.

f. No parental right's are to be severed without a criminal trial (crimes against the child).

6. That all parents be required and have added to their drivers licenses with the department of motor-vehicles a profile or description of each child in their family AS FOLLOWS:

a. full name b. height c. weight d. color eyes e. color hair f. picture of child g. parent's of the child h. childs attending school name.

7. Parental right to shelter where the perpatrator of a violent act has fled the seen shall consist of the following:

a. A parent shall upon filing domestic abuse charges with a peace officer, that peace officer shall accompany the parent and the children to a hotel or motel.

b. The officer is to instruct the hotel clerk that a victom of domestic violence and the children will be staying at the facilities for a period of four days if needed.

c. The Hotel or motel clerk is not to charge the victom or the children for the stay but shall save the receipt and deduct the fees at tax time.

d. Refusal of room will result in a ten thousand dollar fine and or one year in jail if it is found that rooms were available.

8. All attorney's to be divided intoo a seven year segment. That being one year out of every seven years an attorney shall be subject to serve as a judges attorney, attorney for someone who cannot afford one (public defender), or guardian

ad litem.

That a judge shall submitt names to the attorney general of that state or the United States, four names of persons who have not served in that position for seven years, for each vacated position the judge needs filled to operate his or her court. The attorney general is to notify that person of his or her obligation to serve no later than December 1st of the year preceeding service. The perspective judge is to submit his or her persons of interest to serve no later than July 31 of that preceeding year. The attorney is to be ready to serve and be present for duty if needed beginning January 1st, service is to end December 31st unless so Ordered by the perspective judge but is not to exceed longer than three months.

Persons not subject to serve shall be seated or selected judges, elected or selected prosecutors, or elected officials of government, or those attorneys previosly selected within seven years.

Compensation or payment of these duties shall be as follows: each state or the United States shall compensate attorneys wages by collecting attorney's licensing fees up to 77% but not less than 37% of the wages required to pay the attorney serving the position, from attorney's not serving during that year. In other words money shall be gathered from the attorneys in licensing fees and set aside for payment to attorney's serving in these perspective positions. These monies are to be strictly used for these purposes only. The remaining compensation shall come from perspective citizen taxes and or tax right offs by the attorney. Investigations of fraud shall be investigated and prosecuted by the perspective attorney generals.

Attorney's refusing to serve shall be fined wages for five years worth of

service and loss of license for ten years. Problems and or relief sought shall be arbitrated through a person agreeable by both parties.

9. The same shall be done by Doctor's and or Psychologist's and a Psychologist shall be subject to the court for one year, to carry out investigations and status associated with health of the person in question the same as an attorney subject to serve under a seven year p[illegible]n shall be as follows 7 years, 7 years, and 7 years and so on.

The judge or (state for doctors) shall submitt names to the Surgean General of the United States or perspective state. The time limits shall also be the same. The compensation shall be the same but set aside for Doctors and Psychologists only collected by licensing doctors fees collected seperate from attorneys.

10. Oversight and investigations for compliance of this work shall be performed and checked by the United States Judge Marshalls Office.

11. The United States Judge Marshall's Office shall investigate all practices where complaints are made. The United States Judge Surgean Marshalls Office shall consist of the following persons: to be made up of half civilian doctors and half military doctors.

This office is to fall under the Executive branch or the President of the United States of America. Fines and or pulling of licenses shall be utilized, a bi-annual investigation shall be conducted of all facilities.

This office shall also investigate insurance malpractice, pharmacies and all areas associated with medical practice where fines and or licenses may also be pulled.

ad litem.

That a judge shall submitt names to the attorney general of that state or the United States, four names of persons who have not served in that position for seven years, for each vacated position the judge needs filled to operate his or her court. The attorney general is to notify that

Congress shall work with judges and gather task force information upon which instruction is necessary and implement such requirements every sevenyears updating such material or as is required necessary.

13. United States Congress and the United States Senate shall establish a new code of ethics which shall be guidelines in upholding morale values and the importance of the protection of the United States Constitution and its respect for individual rights protections.

14. United States Congress and the United States Senate shall not vote themselves raises unless the following is implemented at the same time as a check and balance mechanism.

a. Congress and the Senate may vote for a raise when the minimum raise is also raised to equal proportions such as an increase of fifty dollars a month means a .25 cent increase in minimum wage.

b. Congress and the Senate may not increase their wages unless all three branches are also increased along with the military and government employees.

c. Should Congress or Senate vote such a measure without enacting both a and b, the following shall apply. All voting members shall be fined ten times the amount of the increase by the attorney general in federal court by the day. Members of Congress and the Senate shall pay such fines within thirty days of said judgement.

15. United States Congress and the

United States Senate shall subject their retirement plans to no less than 40%coming from social security. For truely what is good for the people is good for all people. For not having a vital interest in preserving social security, yet putting one-self in charge of preserving it, takes one-self out of the loop, and the people are not having their best interest's put forward and equally represented. Thus taxation without representation has a double meaning.

16. The United States Congress and the United States Senate shall establish a government insurance premium gathering policy.

a. The policy shall be called "United States Presidential Insurance."

b. Every insurance company licensed to carry insurance shall carry this policy.

c. The insurance company shall enact every seventh policy holder under this agreement by alphabetical order of current policy holders in a rotating policy.

d. The money shall be gathered by the double I.I.R.S. Insurance Income Revenue Service.

e. The premium's shall be gathered in the IIRS and forwarded to Social Security as a whole; not be individually marked, the premium's shall be no higher than other or the main policy premium's.

f. The list shall be updated yearly and given to the IIRS.

g. Premium prices shall be regulated by the government as a need to basis.

h. Claims against the policy shall be written off in taxes by the Insurance company on their main policy.

i. United States Presidential Insurance shall be: malpractice, auto, home, life, and business, but not medical.

17. The United States Senate and Congress shall establish a parental bill of rights and a permanent committee upon which parental rights are written.

18. The United States Congress and Senate shall use these various cases as guidelines for equal protection criteria.

19. States along with judges, and attorneys shall be fined for establishing laws which due not offer equal protections for both parents or are biased toward the mother or father.

20. All county and state appeal judges shall rotate once every seven years to another county in the case of the state. A judge may not serve in the same county until he has served in every county or precinct, or unless he is a chief judge. The governor of the state shall submit two lists to the state Senate. The senate shall approve one, the senate shall have oversight over the chief judges as is outlined in the federal.

21. All federal appeals and district judges shall rotate to another district every seven years, with the exception of chief judges and supreme court judges. This will allow for equal justice across all states, districts and counties. No judge may serve in the same district until he or she has served in all districts unless promoted. By rotating judges citizens have access to all points of view and more equal justice, where stari decisis plays a lesser role in judicial proceedings.

22. The President of the United States shall select the district or appeal's district for each judge available to be rotated and submit 2 lists to the United States.

23. The Senate will confirm one list. If confirmation is not done in ninety days from submission; the presidents selection marked #1 shall automatically go threw.

24. The Senate will also have oversight on Chief Judges, the Senate shall oversee that cases are properly Ordered in a timely manner, pro se litigants are fairly treated, individual rights are being protected and that no case is left in limbo for periods exceeding 90 days.

The oversight shall consist of fines and bringing before the entire United States Senate, a judicial impeachment hearing, for excessive violations by chief judges, fines shall increase by the day, until corrective action is taken.

Chief judges shall have supervisory powers over judges in their districts to over see prompt and fair judicial proceedings are applied in all matters.

The executive branch may fine senators for not bringing valid judicial impeachment proceedings; where the senate must show an overwhelming disregard for Constitutional protections which cannot be validated. This power is reserved to the attorney general; with oversight by & of the entire Supreme Court.

ARGUMENT:

Mr. Olson the Plaintiff is seeking damages of $177,777,777.77. searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Amendment IV: Summary violation: The Plaintiff was never asked to be present at the Psychological visits of the minor child whom the Plaintiff is a parent. The Plaintiff was never consulted about selecting a Psychologist for whom the child was to see. The Plaintiff was never returned a phone call when the Plaintiff requested knowledge about the visits and how they were going. There was no court Order suggesting Psychological visits were to occur at the July 30, 2003 hearing. Yet the Psychologist was instrumental in blocking visits being unsupervised when all others of the court suggested otherwise.

Amendment IX: The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment IX: The Plaintiff's right to see his son should have been given more care and concern. The Plaintiff is being denied his basic rights to parent his child and his involvement in all aspects of the childs care and well being. The Plaintiff is being treated as someone who does not exist and has no rights.

The Plaintiff is part Native American and to suggest this may have influenced such non involvement does suggest in part to these in-actions. The Plaintiff also suggests that his ability to maintain an attorney could have changed this situation and that the Plaintiff was taken advantage of because of it.

Amendment X: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Amendment X: The Plaintiff suggests the following changes in law be implemented as follows:

CONCLUSION:

For truely to ensure equal justice under the law all of United States branches of government must have equal oversight & Congress and Senate must truely stand to serve the wealthy as well as the poor. For to serve has broad meaning and it in itself means to serve all. For when all are served, the system and all people benefit in a just and serving system of justice. This holds the strongest values in democracy and human dignity which benefits all people. Integrity of upholding these values must be in the control of the judges and the right of the people.

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff (Mr. Olson) moves this court for an Order in addition to motions filed pursuant to (1:1557) Introductory Clause-Several Claims Stated in Seperate Counts.

Plaintiff for a first count alleges:

1.1 Future loss of wages prior to retirement: beginning at $2000.00 per month for twenty-two years with increase in rank and commission ending at $4000.00 per month.

Total $2000.00 $4000.00

x 12	x 12 months
24,000.	48,000.
x 22	x 22 years
$528,000.	$1,056,000.

$528,000. + $1,056,000 = $1,584,000. $1,584,000 /22 = 72000 72000/2 = $36,000.00 on average per year x 22 years =$792,000.00

1.2 Future loss of wages after retirement $36,000 x .75 = $27,000. with increases of on average of two percent every four years =$540 after first four years. Averaging with perspective after retirement at age fifty two, threw age seventy. $27,000 x 18 years = $486,000 + pay increases by average of two percent $27,000 x 2% x 2 = $1080.00 on average $27000 + $1080.00 = $28,080.00 x 18 years = $505,440.00

Total wages lost = $792,000.00 + $505,440.00 = $1,297,440.00

Plaintiff for a second account alle ges:

2.1 Future Loss in family Medical full coverage prior to retirement.
Medical check-ups $559.00 annually.
Medical care $12,700.00 annually.
Medication $879.00 annually.
Total= $17,397.00 annually.
Increased medical expenses x 12% =$2087.64 extra per year.
Total with increase $17,397.00 + $2087.64

= $19,484.64
$19,484.64 x 22 years = $428,662.08
2.2 Future loss in medical full coverage after retirement.
Medical check-ups $2847.00 annually.
Medical care $37,456.00 annually.
Medication $6548.00 annually.
Total = $46,851.00
Increased medical expenses x 12% = $5622.12 extra per year. $46851.00 + 5622.12 = $52,473.00 total annually
$52,473.00 x 18 = $944,514.00
Total medical expenses $428,662.08 + $944,514.00 = $1,373,176.08
Plaintiff for a third account alleges:
3.1 Future loss in dental coverage prior to retirement.
Dental check ups $265.00 annually.
Dental care (fillings, crowns, etc.) $445.00 annually
Total $710.00
$710.00 x 5% increase in Dental expenses = $35.5
Total = $710.00 + 35.5 = $745.50
$745.50 annually x 22 years = $16,401.00
3.2 Future loss in Dental coverage after retirement. Dental check ups $489.00 annually. Dental care (surgery, replacement teeth) $2789.00 annually. Total = $3278.00 x 9% increase in dental expenses= $295.00 Total annually $3278.00 + $295.00 = $3573.00 Total $3573.00 x 18 years = $64,314.00 Plaintiff for a fourth count alleges: Attorney's fees $5,000 + $5,000 + $4000 + $1000 in legal assistant, copies ect = $15,000 in total. Punitive damages: loss of Honor, loss of parent-child relationship for almost the entire first four years of the childs life, mental stress, and humiliation and continuing. Total 177,777,777.77 Total loss in all, the Plaintiff is asking for $177,777,777.77 in damages.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that this Petition for a writ of certiorari be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Olson Pro se
380 Bert St. P.O. Box 536
Lake Crystal, MN. 56055
(507) 726-2678

April 15, 2006

APPENDICES

(i) APPENDEX

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
Paula Marie Olson, FAMILY COURT DIVISION
Petitioner,
and ORDER FOR SUPERVISED VISITATION
Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Respondent Court File No. DC 216900

The above-entitled matter came on before the Honorable David M. Duffy, Judge of District Court, upon the application of the guardian ad litem, Mary Catherine Lauhead, pursuant to her authority as established in Paragraph 2 of the Judgment and Decree entered herein on September 11,1997. Notice of such ex parte application was properly provided to counsel, with no objections raised to the court opposing entry of the order.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The Department of Court Services is directed to establish supervised visitation between respondent and the minor child with one of the contracting agencies.

2. The parties shall follow directions of the supervisors and complete all requested authorizations for release of information.

3. If either of the parties is non-cooperative, the agency is to refer the matter back to the appointing Referee or Judge for such orders as may be necessary.

4. The sanctions of Contempt against any non-complaint party for failure to comply with a proper Court Order may be available.

5. The Clerk of this court shall mail a copy of this Order to the attorneys of record of the parties and the guardian

ad litem as proper service for all purposes. Each attorney shall personally serve a copy of this order upon his/her client and provide an affidavit of such personal service to the court.

6. The Clerk of this court shall mail a copy of this Order to the Department of Court Services for implementation of its terms.

Dated: October 2, 1997.

"sDavid M. Duffy
David M. Duffy
Judge of District Court
Family Court Division

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
FAMILY COURT DIVISION

In Re the Marriage of:
Paula Marie Olson,
N/k/a Paula Marie Zamzow, ORDER
Petitioner,
and Court File No. DC 216900
Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Respondent,

The above-entitled matter came duly on for hearing before Judge David M. Duffy on July 1, 1998.

APPEARANCES:

Gerald O. Williams, Jr., Esq., appeared for Petitioner Paula Marie Olson, n/k/a Paula Marie Zamzow.

Jeffrey Alan Olson appeared pro se.

Mary C. Lauhead, Esq., appeared as guardian ad litem.

Based upon the evidence adduced, the argument of counsel, and all of the files, records, and proceedings herein,

THE COURT FINDS:

1. These were post-divorce decree motions.
2. Procedural history of this case.

a. This has a long and troubled history.

b. The petition for dissolution was filed on 10-13-95.

c. There was credible evidence that Respondent abused Petitioner during their marriage.

d. Respondent was granted supervised visitation. He chose to forego supervised visitation until the Court would determine that he may have unsupervised visitation.

e. Since December 1995, there have been numerous hearings in this matter, concerning financial, custodial, and visitation issues. Hearings and trial dates are listed below:

(1) 12-12-96, Dorn, Hearing.
(2) 3-4-96, Dorn, hearing.
(3) 9-9-96, Dorn, hearing.
(4) 2-20-97, Dorn, hearing.
(5) 2-27-97, Dorn, hearing.
(6) 4-10-97, Duffy, hearing.
(7) 5-1-97, Duffy, hearing.
(8) 5-27-97, Duffy, trial session.
(9) 5-29-97, Duffy, trial session.
(10) 5-29-97, Duffy, trial session.
(11) 7-1-98, Duffy, Hearing.

f. Respondent has filed numerous papers with this court during the pendency of this matter. The following is a list of these papers, along with a sketch of Respondent's various requests and claims:

(1) Respondent's letter to Opposing Counsel, dated 1-2-97.

(a) Proposing a "cool down period" where no visitation shall take place.

(b) Claims Petitioner's mother has had "multiple accidents, speeding tickets..."

(c) "[T]his case is soon to enter in[ ] to the media spot light."

(d) There is "racial prejudice

now in this case..."

(2) Respondent's Affidavit, dated 12-5-97.

(a) "I believe there have been various manipulations of Penal Codes and Rules of Proceedings twisted in this case to gain jurisdiction...in the state of Minnesota.

(b) Petitioner's application for a California driver's license "nullifies jurisdiction [in Minnesota]."

(c) The Constitution and laws protect servicemen from finding jurisdiction and having to defend a case in another state.

(d) There is "racial hatred" in this case.

(e) "W[']re just waiting [for this case] to be brought to federal court and challenged..."

(f) Respondent claims he is a much decorated war hero.

(g) Respondent is requesting "three hundred a[nd[fifty thousand dollars in damages in an out of court settlement..."

(h) Respondent is "requesting an investigation into the ethics violations of Petitioner['[s coun[sel] and Petitioner[']s sister Suzy Zamzow, who is the underlying perpetrator of these felony acts."

(i) "I pray for a quick and easy settlement, before they make movies and write books about this case."

(j) Respondent discussed his ethnic background and religion (two pages).

(k) Respondent discussed family problems in Petitioner's extended family (one and one-half pages).

(l) The State of Minnesota "establish[ed] gender bias, race bias."

(m) This case is "a violation of

my constitutional rights to be discriminated
in this court room."

(n) The Minnesota courts "hate Indians."

(o) Respondent will take this case to "the federal court."

(4) Respondent's "Amended Responsive Notice of Motion and Motion," 4-3-97.

(a) Move case "to an unbiased forum that being the U.S. Supreme Court."

(b) Disciplinary action against Petitioner for her not allowing visitation.

(c) An order addressing Respondent's "loss of career."

(d) That the "Court of Fraud" establish residency.

(e) An order "granting the Petitioner one year in the county jail."

(f) Ethics violations of Petitioner's attorney:

(1) For processing fraudulant claims to gain jurisdiction in this court.

(2) For "directly putting the security of the United States of America at risk."

(3) For "establishing a case in which Stare Decisis could be used to follow."

(4) For "defrauding the United States Marines of an overqualified individual" "who had set himself apart in becoming a United States Marine." All of the years of training Respondent were "laid to waste" because Petitioner sought jurisdiction in this Court.

(g) Revoke Petitioner's sisters attorneys license.

(h) Impose fine on Petitioner's attorney.

(i) Place Petitioner's attorney in jail for one year.

(j) Impose fine on Petitioner for obtaining jurisdiction in this Court.

(k) Impose fines on Petitioner's family members for helping and housing Petitioner.

(l) An order granting Respondent dissolution "in view of Due Process."

(m) An order granting the "media" the right to review all files relating to this case, and to be presented for "every court session."

(n) An order granting Respondent's attorneys the right to make copies of everything in the case file "for process in Federal Court."

(o) An order "granting peaceful demonstrations at the court house and at the state capital in Minnesota."

(p) An order "clarifying who the responsible judge is...for the United States Senate Committee so administrative action can be taken..."

(q) An order declaring "all services run by the state involving...supervised visitation are biased and unconstitutional.

(r) That the employees running these state services "are predominantly divorced, seperated, or gender biased."

(s) That for the state agencies providing supervised visitation "servises to receive state or federal money [they] must employ at least fifty percent male employee[]s...TITLE VII (CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964)."

(t) An act to enforce the Constitutional right to prevent discrimination on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes."

(u) "For an Order declaring these services biased until at which time they employ fifty percent male, and should receive no funding until that time."

(v) For an Order declaring Arbitration Court unconstitutional...Is set out to be corrupted by attorneys not acting under any restraints or loyalty to the Constitution of the United States."

(w) That it was "organized legal crime" for an attorney to write a check to a Referee.

(x) "For an Order opening this case up to the Attorney General of Minnesota for possible settlement."

(y) "For an Order addressing the violation of Respondent[']s Miranda Rights."

(z) That this motion is based "upon the law of the State of Minnesota, the United States Constitution, and Congressional laws governing the protection of servicemen."

(aa) Respondent recited Articles III and IV, and Amendments IV and VII, of the U.S. Constitution.

(bb) Respondent recited portions of "Marbury v. Madison."

(cc) Respondent recited something called, "The Court[']s Docket And Screening Cases."

(dd) Respondent recited portions of "Mcgrain v. Daugherty."

(ee) Respondent recited portions of "McColloch v. Maryland."

(ff) Respondent claimed, "This, then, is not a case of confidence, and we must consider it as it really is? A fraud!"

(gg) Respondent recited "Minn. Stat. 518.177, Notification Regarding Deprivation Of Parental Rights Law."

(hh) "[Lack of caring whether the child sees its father] will not look favorable in the law suit against Minnesota."

(ii) "[The amount of time this case has taken, and the paper work involved,] is totally sad in view of e[]thics, moral judgment, lack of involvement by the court..."

(jj) "We hope to [] help you in any way we can with this problem so you can catch back up with the rest of the union there in Minnesota."

3. In an Order by this Court, dated 4-15-97, regarding a hearing held on 4-20-97, Respondent had moved this Court for the following:

(1) Review by U.S. Supreme Court.

(2) That Petitioner be incarcerated for one year.

(3) That Petitioner's attorney be incarcerated for one year and that his license to practice law be revoked.

(4) That this Court issue an order stating that the arbitration court is

totally biased to favor the mother in all cases.

(5) That this Court lacked jurisdiction to hear the matter.

(6) This Court found:

(a) That Respondent was very angry, confused, problematic, and did not have a working knowledge of the legal system or precedent.

(b) That Respondent's ideas and demands resemble that of a posse comitatus.

4. The dissolution resulted in a three-day trial--on May 27, 28, 29, 1997.

5. Respondent contacted this Court's chambers on numerous occasions during the pendency of this matter.

6. This Court has consumed a great deal of time in reading Respondent's papers and motions, and in answering Respondent's telephone calls.

7. Respondent filed the following documents for this motion hearing:

a. "Conclusion," dated 11-24-97.

b. "Affidavit of Jeffrey Olson," dated 2-10-98.

c. "Declaration Statement," dated 3-2-98.

d. "Motion and Motion for Change of Custody," dated 3-9-98.

e. "Notice of Motion," dated 3-14-98.

f. "Affidavit," dated 3-21-98.

g. "Affidavit," dated 3-31-98.

h. "Proposal for Settlement," dated 420-98.

i. "Motion,"dated 6-9-98.

j. "Expedited Motion and Motion for Order," dated 6-9-98.

k. "Motion and Order Compelling Production of Documents and Imposing Sanctions," 6-12-98.

l. "Motion and Order for Seperate Trials Severance of Action," dated 6-24-98.

m. "Affidavit of Motion for Seperate Trials Severance of Action," dated 6-24-98.

n. "Affidavit,"dated 6-24-98.

o. "Motion for Sanctions in Discrimination Case," dated 6-24-98.

p. "Motion for Order Compelling Production of Documents and Imposing Sanctions," dated 6-24-98.

q. "Motion for Expenses, Affidavits Made in bad faith," dated 6-24-98.

r. "Memorandum of Law," dated 6-24-98.

s. "Response to Affidavit of Petitioner," dated 6-24-98.

t. "Proposed Order Granting Motion for Expenses--Affidavits Made in Bad Faith," undated.

u. "Order Compelling Production of Documents and Imposing Sanctions," undated.

v. "Memorandum of Law for Change of

Custody," unsigned and undated.

W. "Order," undated.

8. Within the above documents, Respondent requested the following:

a. Production of documents (but did not list documents demanded).

b. Answers to interrogatories (but did not list what interrogatories).

c. Terminate Respondent's obligation to pay Petitioner's attorney's fees.

d. Terminate Respondents obligation to pay a debt of $6,000 owed to Petitioner's mother.

e. "Holding" of all child support and benefits.

f. Change of Custody.

g. Disallow petitioner from using the following defenses:

(1) Petitioner not properly served.

(2) Petitioner did not have adequate time to respond.

(3) Petitioner did not acquire counsel.

(4) Petitioner did not respond on ground of privilege.

(5) Petitioner could not respond because she was not contacted.

h. Enter judgment by default for a change of custody.

i. Change visitation from supervised to unsupervised.

j. Respondent is willing to settle on $200,000 binding any further matters beyond the June 23, 1998 hearing on custody.

k. If Petitioner fails to show on hearing date, Respondent will request:

(1) That Court will issue arrest warrents.

(2) That Court suspend license to practice medicine on Ms. Judy Zamzow.

(3) That Court suspend license to

practice law on Ms. Susan Zamzow.

(4) That Court suspend license to teach on Ms. Elizabeth Zamzow.

(5) A court order suspending Mr. Steve Zamzow from working in any banking system.

9. Within the above documents, Respondent made the following claims:

a. Petitioner left state without permission.

b. Parental kidnapping.

c. Respondent has received no visitation since trial in May 1997.

d. Petitioner is not complying with order for visitation.

e. Petitioner is obstructing Respondent's right to see his child.

10. Respondent's motion papers for this hearing, and for earlier hearings, are redundant, and make many incredible and unsubstantiated legal claims.

11. Respondent's intent in filing the above-described motion papers was to harass Petitioner and to burden this Court.

12. Petitioner's responsive motion, dated 6-17-98 requested the following:

a. Deny Respondent's motion for a change of custody.

b. Award Petitioner attorney's fees.

c. Require Petitioner to show cause before filing any subsequent motions pertaining to this case.

13. Respondent has failed to make a prima facia showing that grounds exist for a change of custody under the Nice-Peterson doctrine. Nice-Peterson v. Nice-Peterson, 310 N.W. 2d 471 (Minn.1981). Specifacally, Respondent has failed to show that a significant change of circumstances has occurred since the Amended Judgment and Decree was filed on October 6, 1997, or that a change of circumstances endangers

the child's physical or emotional health.
14. Under Rule 11 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure, Parties may not present motions or other papers to the Court if they are "interposed for any improper purpose, such as to harass or cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation." If a Court finds that a party has violated Rule 11, the Court may impose on the party "an appropriate sanction," insluding reasonable attorney's fees.
15. Respondent's motions and papers are frivolous and repetitious, and were filed for the purpose of harrassing Petitioner.
16. Respondent's motions and papers were intended to cause the Petitioner to incur unnecessary attorney's fees and trouble.
17. Respondent's frivolous motions and papers caused the Court to consume a significant amount of its resources unnecessarily.
18. Under the Amended Judgment and Decree, filed on October 6, 1997, a guardian ad litem was appointed and Respondent was granted supervised visitation. Supervised visitation was to be established by the Hennepin County Department of Court Services. Unsupervised visitation was to be granted only if Respondent cooperated and "demonstrate[d] that he is capable of honest,courteous behavior and mature parenting."
19. Respondent has not cooperated with the agency supervising visitation.
20. Respondent has not exercised his right to supervised visitation and has not attempted to maintain a relationship with the parties' minor child.
21. Respondent's actions and lack of cooperation with Family Court Services show he is not ready for supervised or

unsupervised visitation with the parties' minor child.

22. Petitioner's reasonable costs and attorney's fees in this matter are $2,397.70. That but for Respondent's frivolous motions to this Court, Petitioner would not have incurred these costs and attorney's fees.

23. As the procedural history of this case described above shows, this Court has been more than patient with Respondent's numerous and duplicative motions and papers, and with his many incredible legal theories and claims. This procedural history also shows that Respondent has been given his "day in Court" through numerous hearings and a three day court trial.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That each and every motion of the Respondent, listed in the documents contained in Finding Number Seven, and desribed in Findings Numbered Eight and Nine, above, including a motion for a change of custody, is denied.

2. That Respondent shall bring no further motions before this court except by first appearing before the Chief Judge of Hennepin County District Court to establish probable cause for the relief requested. this sanction is justified because of Respondent's numerous and duplicative motions and papers, and because of his many incredible legal theories and claims--none of which have been found by this Court to have any merit.

3. That Respondent's visitation with the parties' minor child Jake Tyler Olson is suspended pending further Court Order.

4. That Respondent may obtain an Order for resumed visitation by cooperating with the professionals involved (namely,

the guardian ad litem, Court Services), and providing affirmative evidence of his cooperation to the Chief Judge of Hennepin County District Court.

5. That the parties shall comply with Rule 108 of the Mionnesota General Rules of Practice for District Courts (regarding service of papers upon the guardian ad litem), and shall notify the guardian ad litem of their current addresses, and any subsequent change of address.

6. That Respondent shall not harass Petitioner, Members of Petitioner's family, Petitioner's attorney, individuals at Petitioner's law firm, the Court, the Court's staff, the guardian ad litem, individuals at Court Services, or individuals at any visitation agency to which Respondent is referred.

7. That Petitioner is awarded attorney's fees in the amount of $2,398.70.

8. That if Respondent fails to pay these attorney's fees within sixty days of this Order, Petitioner shall have and recover judgment against Respondent in the amount of $2,397.70.

9. That this Order was issued by the Court verbally, and is immediately binding.

10. That all previous Orders of this Court remain in full force and effect.

Dated: 7-29-98.

BY THE COURT:

"sDavid M. Duffy
David M. Duffy
Judge of District Court

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Plaintiff,

Civ. No. 98-2562/RHK/JMM

v. ORDER
State of Minnesota;
Kissoon, Clugg, Linder
& Ditberner, Ltd.,
Defendants.

Jeffrey Alan Olson,Lake Crystal, Minnesota for Plaintiff.
Peter M. Ackerberg, Assistant Attorney General, St. Paul, Minnesota, for Defendant State of Minnesota.
Gerald O. Williams Jr., Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Edina, Minnesota, for Defendant Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Ltd.

Before the Court are the Defendants' Motions to Dismiss. After thorough reading of the Plaintiff's Complaint, and upon all files, records, and proceedings herein, the Court, sua sponte, determines that the Complaint fails to state a claim against either Defendant upon which relief can be granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b) (6). Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** THAT THE Plaintiff's Complaint)Doc.No.1) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.**

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

February 22,1999 "sRichard H. Kyle
Richard H. Kyle
United States District Judge
Filed Feb 22, 1999
Francis E. Dosal, Clerk
Judgment Entd. Feb 22, 1999
Deputy Clerk "s"

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Plaintiff,
v. Civ. No. 98-2562/RHK/

ORDER

State of Minnesota and Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Ltd.,
Defendants.

Jeffrey Alan Olson, pro se, Lake Crystal, Minnesota, for Plaintiff.
Peter M. Ackerburg, Assistant Attorney General, St. Paul, Minnesota, for Defendant State of Minnesota.
Gerald O. Williams Jr., Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Edina, Minnesota, for Defendant Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner,Ltd.

Before the Court is Jeffrey Alan Olson's ("Olson") Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. No. 15). Olson moves this Court to extend the time by which he must file his notice of appeal from its February 22, 1999 Memorandum Opinion and Order from 30 to 180 days. Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(5) provides that a district court "may extend the time to file a notice of appeal if: (i) a party so moves no later than 30 days after the time prescribed by this Rule 4(a) expires; and (ii) that party shows excusable neglect or good cause." While Olson has moved for an extention of time within 30 days after the time prescribed by Rule4(a), he has failed to show excusable neglect or good cause. Olson argues that the Court should grant his Motion "for reasons of intent to refile motions in the lower court of Hennepin county" and give the Defendants an opportunity to settle the instant case. The Court finds that neither reason constitutes excusable neglect or good cause and, therefore, will deny Olson's Motion for Enlargement of Time.

For the foregoing reasons, and based

upon all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS ORDERED THAT Olson's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Doc. No. 15) is **DENIED.**

April 15,1999 "sRichard H. Kyle
RICHARD H. KYLE
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
District Of Minnesota

Jeffrey Alan Olson Civ. File No.99-1360
Plaintiff, (PAM/JGL)
V. MEMORANDUM & ORDER
State of Minnesota;
David M. Duffy;
Diana S. Eagon;
Marybeth Dorn;
Mary Catherine Lauhead; &
Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Ditberner Ltd.
Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12 (b) (1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. For the reasons set forth below, the Defendants' Motion is granted and Plaintiffs' Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

DISCUSSION

Plaintiff Jeffrey Alan Olson bases his pro se Complaint on federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. &1331, citing as a cause of action "statutory [sic] Law on Dissolution? Seperation [sic] Jurisdiction: California to Minnesota." The Complaint includes five counts that, as far as the Court can discern, can be summarized as follows. Count I alleges lack of jurisdiction by the Minnesota state court that ruled upon the Plaintiff's marital dissolution, child custody, and

visitation rights. Count II alleges that Plaintiff was treated unfairly in the Minnesota dissolution, custody, and visitation hearings because the Plaintiff acted as his own attorney in those proceedings. Count III alleges that Plaintiff's visitation with his son and stepdaughter was improperly denied by the Minnesota state court. Count IV alleges that Plaintiffs career was damaged by the Minnesota court improperly taking jurisdiction over Plaintiff's dissolution, custody, and visitation matters. Count V. alleges that the Minnesota court improperly refused to grant Plaintiff a continuance in one of the state court dissolution, custody, and visitation proceedings, and that a result of such refusal, Plaintiff lost his career in the United States Marine Corps.

The Court first determines whether subject matter jurisdiction exists. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). "Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They posses only that power authorized by Constitution and Statute,...which is not to be expanded by judicial decree...It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, and the burden of establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction." Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 511 U.s. 375, 377 (1994) (citation omitted). Plaintiff admits that no diversity of citizenship jurisdiction exists because both Plaintiff and Defendants are now citizens of the state of Minnesota. See 28 U.S.C & 1332. Instead, Plaintiff bases his complaint on federal question jurisdiction. However, that the "whole subject of the domestic relations of husband and wife, parent

and child, belongs to the laws of the states, and not to the laws of the United States." In re Burrus, 136 U.S. 586, 593 (1890). The Plaintiff has thus failed to expressly plead any claim within the Court's subject matter jurisdiction. However, the court will examine whether the pro se Plaintiff has examine whether the pro se Plaintiff has a possible claim within this Court's jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. & 1983 based on alleged violations of due process guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

Plaintiff's putative due process claim against Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner fails because the Complaint does not establish any facts sufficient to indicate any state action by that Defendant. See Brown V. Delmuro, No. 98-1819, 1998 WL 547864, *1 (8th Cir. Aug. 28, 1998) (unpublished opinion) (noting that opposing counsel was not a state actor); Johnson v. Outboard Marine Corp., 172 F.3d 531, 536 (8th Cir. 1999) (noting that private actors may only incur Section 1983 liability if the plaintiff establishes a meeting of the minds between the private and state actors). Plaintiff's claim against the State of Minnesota is barred by the Eleventh Amendment. See Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida, 517 U.S. 44,54 (1996) (noting that no federal jurisdiction exists for suits against unconsenting states). Plaintiff's putitive due process claim against the remaining Defendants (several judges and a guardian ad litem) fails because such Defendants are entitled to either judicial or quasi-judicial immunity. See Delmuro, 1998 WL 547864, at *1 (finding that family court judges and guardian ad litem were entitled to absolute judicial

immunity and quasijudicial immunity, respectively, for acts during divorce and child custody proceedings). Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim within the Court's jurisdiction upon which relief can be granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), 12(b)(6).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, and upon all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT

1. Defendants Motion to Dismiss (clerk Doc. No.5) is GRANTED: and

2. Plaintiff Jeffrey Alan Olson's Complaint (Clerk Doc. No. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

February 16, 2000 "sPaul A. Magnunson
Paul A. Magnunson
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. Jeffrey Alan Olson
380 Bert Street, P.O. Box 536
Lake Crystal, Mn. 56055

Re: Olson V. Duffy, Civ. No. 99-1360 (PAM/JGL)

Dear Mr. Olson:

The Court is in reciept of your papers filed February 23, 200, entitled "Motion for A NEW TRIAL," and filed on March 29, 2000, entitled "Responsive Notice." The Court will not consider these papers, or any papers that you may file in the future relating to this lawsuit, because your lawsuit was dismissed with prejudice by the Court, as explained in its Memorandum Opinion and Order filed February 17, 2000. Because your lawsuit has been dismissed, your only redress is to file

an appeal with the Clerk of Court of Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, 500 Warren E. Burger Federal Building, 316 North Robert Street, St. Paul, Mn 55101.
May 10, 2000 s"Paul A. Magnuson
Paul A. Magnuson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Jeffrey Alan Olson Civ. File No. 99-1360 (PAM/JGL)
Plaintiff,

v. MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

State of Minnesota;
David M. Duffy;
Diana S. Eagon;
William R. Howard;
Marybeth Dorn;
Mary Catherine Lauhead; and
Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner Ltd
Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for a New Trial. In a February 16, 2000 Order, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint alleging: (1) lack of jurisdiction by the Minnesota state court that ruled upon the Plaintiff's marital dissolution, child custody, and visitation rights; (2) that Plaintiff was treated unfairly in the Minnesota dissolution, custody, and visitation hearings because tha Plaintiff acted as his own attorney in those proceedings; (3) that Plaintiff's visitation with his son and stepdaughter was improperly denied by the Minnesota state court; (4) that Plaintiff's career was damaged by the Minnesota court improperly taking jurisdiction over Plaintiff's dissolution, custody, and visitation matters; and (5) that the Minnesota court improperly refused

to grant Plaintiff a continuance in one of the state court dissolution, custody, and visitation proceedings, and that a result of such refusal, Plaintiff lost his career in the United States Marine Corps. The Court treated Plaintiff's Complaint as alleging a possible claim within this Court's jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. & 1983 based on alleged violations of due process guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. For the reasons set forth in the February 17, 2000 Order, the Court ruled that the Plaintiff's Complaint failed to state a claim within the Court's jurisdiction upon which relief can be granted. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), 12 (b)(6). Judgment was entered against the Plaintiff on February 17, 2000. Upon reviewing all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, including the memorandum submitted in support of Plaintiff's Motion for a New Trial, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Motion for as New Trial is without merit.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, and upon all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs Motion for a New Trial (clerk Doc. No. 12) is DENIED.

July 27, 2000. s"Paul A. Magnuson
Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Court Judge

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT
No.00-2614

Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Appellant,
v.
David M. Duffy, Judge;

Diana S. Eagon, Judge;
William R. Howard, Judge;
Marybeth Dorn, Referee;
Mary Catherine Lauhead,
Guardian Ad Litem,
Appellees,
Kissoon, Clugg, Linder &
Dittberner Ltd.,
Defendants.
Submitted: December 4, 2000
Filed: December 7, 2000
Before BEAM, FAGG, and LOKEN, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.
Re: 00-2614 Jeffrey Alan Olson vs. David M. Duffy.

Jeffrey Olson appeals from the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint arising out of a child-custody proceeding. Upon de novo review of the record and the parties' submissions on appeal, see Springdale Educ. Ass'n v. Springdale Sch. Dist.,133 F.3d 649, 651 (8th Cir. 1998) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(6) dismissal); Lemonds v. St. Louis County, 222 F.3d 488, 492 (8th Cir. 2000) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(1) dismissal), we affirm for the reasons stated in the district court's order. See 8th Cir. R. 47B. We also deny appellant's motion on appeal.
A true copy.
Attest:
CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

United States Court Of Appeals
For The Eighth Circuit

No. 00-2614
Jeffrey Alan Olson, Order Denying Petition
Appellant, for Rehearing and
v. for Rehearing En Banc

David M. Duffy, et al.,
Appellees.

The petition for rehearing en banc is denied. The petition for rehearing by the panel is also denied.

January 26, 2001
Order Entered at the Direction of the Court: "sMichael E. Gans
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals Eighth Circuit

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Washington, D.C. 20543
March 5, 2001

Mr. Jeffrey Alan Olson
380 Bert Street P.O.Box 536
Lake Crystal, MN. 56055

Re: Jeffrey Alan Olson v. David M. Duffy, Judge, Minnesota District Court, 4th Judicial District, et al.
No.00-1366

Dear Mr. Olson:

The petition for writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed March 1, 2001 and placed on the docket March 2, 2001 as No. 00-1366.

Forms are enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.

Unless you have already done so, please promptly serve opposing counsel with 3 copies of your petition and forward proof of service to this office pursuant to Rule 29.5.

Sincerely,
William K. Suter, Clerk
by Ruth Jones s"
Ruth Jones
Assistant

Enclosures

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
FAMILY COURT DIVISION

In Re the Marriage of:
Paula Marie Zamzow,
Petitioner, Court file No. DC 216900
and ORDER
Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Respondent.

This matter came before the undersigned for hearing on December 15, 2003. Gerald O. Williams, Jr. Esquire, appeared for Petitionerherein, and Respondent appeared pro se. Jackie Cardinal, guardian ad litem for the parties' minor child, Jake Tyler Olson (hereinafter "Tyler") also appeared.

THE COURT FINDS:

1. The custody evaluator, Gregg Kowalsky, & the guardian ad litem, Jackie Cardinal, have recommended expanded, unsupervised parenting time for Respondent and Tyler.
2. However, Tyler's therapist, Bonnie Ellingboe, has recommended that unsupervised parenting time be delayed.
3. Bonnie's Ellingboe's recommendation was provided to the court in a letter dated December 11, 2003. Respondent objected to the admission of the document due to his lack of opportunity to respond to the document.
4. The court accepted the document over Respondent's objection, subject to Respondent's right to seek reconsideration of this court order based upon lack of notice of the therapist's recommendation.
5. The guardian ad litem also recommended that Respondent work with a parenting coach or take parenting education classes to better understand where Tyler is

developmentally.
6. Respondent's parenting time has been supervised by Petitioner and Petitioner's friend, Nancy Nelson.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Respondent's parenting time with supervision shall continue. Petitioner shall refrain from further attendance at Respondent's supervised parenting time. The Parenting time shall continue to be supervised by Nancy Nelson or one of Petitioner's family members.
2. Unless otherwise agreed, the supervised parenting time shall take place on the first three Saturdays of each month from 1:00 to 4:00 P.M.
3. Tyler shall continue to consult with Bonnie Ellingboe, at minimum once per month, but more often if possible.
4. Bonnie Ellingboe shall issue a report within ninety (90) days of the date of this order, or sooner, if possible, with regard to her recommendation for Respondent's parenting time.
5. The guardian ad litem shall pursue the appointment of a parenting coach to assist the parties in proceeding forward with Respondent's reunification with Tyler in a manner that is consistent with Tyler's best interests.
6. Jackie Cardinal shall continue on as guardian ad litem and shall inform the court if the parties can agree to proceed with the custody evaluator's recommendation of expanded and unsupervised parenting time, or whether an additional hearing will be necessary.
7. Service of this Order may be made by United States mail and the same shall be in lieu of and effective as personal service.

Dated 12/29/03 s"Bruce A. Peterson

Bruce A. Peterson

Judge of District Court

The Counseling Clinic, Inc. Mental Health & Chemical Dependancy Treatment Since 1979.

December 11, 2003

To Whom It May ConCern,

I have seen Tyler Olson with his mother Paula Zamzow for three counseling sessions. The purpose of this counseling was to help Tyler deal with the emotional issues of being reunited with his father after no contact for several years. I have observed the following in my sessions with Tyler and his Mother:

:Tyler seems like a well-adjusted typical 8-year old boy. He plays with toys in my office and responds to my questions appropriately.

:Tyler is nervous about his meetings with his father but cooperates with the visits. It is hard for him to determine where his father fits into his life, as he has had no contact for so long. I have discussed with him the importance of parents and children having a relationship.

:Tyler's Mother has received several letters from the father Jeffrey Olson where the contents were somewhat threatening. I believe these letters have upset Tyler's mother and Tyler. I believe Paula the mother is somewhat fearful for Yyler's safety if the visits were unsupervised.

:I would not recommend that Tyler have unsupervised visits with his father in the near future considering the nature of the letters, the father's past history of domestic violence as reported by the mother and Tyler's apprehension about his reunion with his father. Tyler reported to me that he would be afraid of having unsupervised or overnight visits with

his father at this time.

If you have further questions, please call me.

Sincerely s"Bonnie Ellingboe, MA
Bonnie Ellingboe, MA
Licensed Psychologist

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

In the Matter of the Appointment of a Referee ORDER

Whereas, there is a need to continue the timely disposition of matters that come before Judicial Officers in the Fourth Judicial District, and Whereas, it is necessary that a suitable person learned in the law be appointed as temporary Referee to hear cases pursuant to Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 53 upon reference by the Court and to hear such other matters as may be assigned to him/her by the Court Administrator.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby ordered that Jeanice Reding, Attorney Identification No. 212684, be and hereby is appointed a tempory Referee of the Fourth Judicial District; that he/she be compensated using the Minnesota Judicial Branch classification of Referee, that he/she work no more than forty (40) hours per week, and that he/she shall serve in that capacity subject to the will and discretion of the District Court and until its further Order.

Dated: 1-30-04

BY THE COURT

S"Kevin S. Burke
Kevin S. Burke
Chief Judge

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

In Re the Marriage of:
Paula Marie Zamzow,
Petitioner,
and
Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Respondent.

Court File No. DC 216900
ORDER

The above-entitled matter came before Referee Jeannice M. Reding for a hearing on March 1, 2004. The Petitioner was represented by Gerald O. Williams, Jr., Esq. Jeffrey Olson appeared pro se.

Based on the evidence adduced and all the files, records, and proceedings, the court makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner and Respondent were divorced by Judgment and Decree dated August 28,1997.

2. The parties have one minor child together, Jake Tyler Olson, born March 22, 1995 ("Tyler").

3. The Petitioner had a child from a previous relationship, Mallory Zamzow, born April 12, 1991. The Judgment and Decree did not grant the Respondent any rights to visitation with Mallory. The crux of the pending motion is the Respondent's request for parenting time with Mallory and joint legal custody of Mallory.

4. The Respondent has not seen Mallory in over six years, since prior to entry of the Judgment and Decree.

5. The Respondent has only recently reestablished parenting time with Tyler, beginning in the end of 2003. The Respondent's parenting time with Tyler is still supervised at this point.

6. The record in this matter does

not support the Respondent's request for parenting time or visitation with Mallory. The Respondent is not Mallory's biological father. The Respondent has not seen Mallory in over six years. Other than general statements that his having parenting time with Mallory would be in her "best interests", he has not made a prima facie showing how that would be in Mallory's best interests.

7. On the contrary, the facts in the record weigh against establishment of parenting time/visitation with Mallory. First, the Respondent was not granted any rights to see Mallory and has not seen her in six years. There is no evidence in the record that Mallory has expressed any interest in seeing him.

8. The two reasons the Respondent was able to articulate for parenting time with Mallory were as follows. First, he stated if Mallory was present Tyler would be more comfortable during visitation. This relates to the interests of Tyler, and is not related to the best interests of Mallory.

9. The Respondent also stated that he had a good relationship with Mallory before the parties were divorced. The Respondent's relationship with Mallory before the parties were divorced, although not disputed, was over six years ago therefore it has little or no bearing on current circumstances. The Respondent has not established how visitation with Mallory would be in her interests especially since he was not granted parenting time with Mallory in the Judgment and Decree.

10. The Respondent has not carried his burden of establishing a basis under Minn. Stat. Sec. 257C.08, subd. 4 for visitation with Mallory.

11. The Respondent also seeks joint legal custody of Mallory. Since Mallory is not the child of the Respondent, the Respondent was not granted any custody rights to Mallory in the parties' Judgment and Decree.

12. The Respondent has not established that he has any standing to seek custody of Mallory. The Respondent is not a parent of the child and he has not shown a prima facie case that the Petitioner, the child's natural parent, is not fulfilling or cannot fulfill parental duties with respect to the child. The Respondent has not made a prima facie showing that the Petitioner is unable or unfit to raise her own child.

13. The bulk of the Respondent's motions are related to his requests to have joint physical custody of Mallory and parenting time with Mallory. Since both of those motions will be denied herein, the majority of the remainder Respondent's motions will be denied.

14. The Respondent has not shown a basis to provide him compensatory parenting time with Mallory because he never had any scheduled parenting time with Mallory.

15. The Respondent has not shown a basis for requiring the Respondent to provide transportation for parenting time with Mallory.

16. The Respondent has not shown a basis for requiring the Petitioner to take parenting classes regarding his relationship with Mallory.

17. The Respondent has not shown a basis for requiring the Petitioner to take anger management classes. The Respondent's evidence regarding the Petitioner's anger was related to her actions at the time of the Judgment and Decree, which is too old to be relevant

at this time.

18. The Respondent has not shown a basis for requiring a psychological evaluation of the Petitioner. He has provided no facts upon which to require a psychological evaluation of the Petitioner.

19. The Respondent has shown no basis for assigning a guardian ad litem to represent the best interests of the minor child, Mallory Zamzow. There is no evidence in the record which would require a mandatory appointment and insufficient evidence to support a permissive appointment of a guardian ad litem.

20. There is no evidence in the record to support requiring Mr. Olson to pay for medical insurance coverage for Mallory. He is already ordered to carry this insurance for Tyler.

21. The Petitioner agreed to provide Respondent with her telephone number so that he could contact her in case of emergency.

22. The Respondent has shown no basis to decrease the payment he is required to make to Mr. Williams' law firm every month.

23. The Petitioner requests that the Respondent's child support obligation be increased.

24. The Respondent is employed by the U.S. Postal Service. He makes, on average, the equivalent of $18.76 per hour, which results in gross yearly income of $39,020. Although the Respondent occasionally works overtime, overtime is not required to be worked. Also, he was in the military at the time of filing the Summons and Petition and did not work overtime at that time. There is no basis in the record for including overtime in the Respondent's income for purposes of

calculating child support.

25. The Respondent has average net monthly income of $2,137, after deductions of $228 for his 7% pension contribution, $726 for his federal, state, and Social Security taxes (single/1.5 exemptions used due to alternating exemptions), $31 for union dues, and $130 for medical insurance.

26. Guidelines child support on this amount would be $534. This is at least 20% and $50 higher than the prior child support obligation of $438, therefore the Respondent shall pay $534 per month for child support beginning March 1, 2004.

27. The Petitioner seeks an award of attorney fees and costs. The Court does not find any egregious behavior on the part of Respondent with respect to providing his income verification.

28. However, the Court finds that the Respondent's requests for parenting time with Mallory and joint legal custody of Mallory were frivolous, unsupported by any evidence, and unreasonably contributed to the length and costs of this proceeding. The portion of the Petitioner's attorney fees incurred due to this part of the proceeding is $984. The Respondent shall pay to the Petitioner's attorney $984 as and for attorney fees.

ORDER

1. Respondent's motion for parenting time with Mallory Zamzow and joint legal custody of Mallory Zamzow is denied.

2. The Petitioner is ordered to provide her telephone number to the Respondentfor use in case of emergencies.

3. The Petitioner is awarded attorney fees in the amount of $984.

4. Beginning March 1, 2004, the Respondent is ordered to pay $534 per

month to the Petitioner as and for child support for the minor child Tyler.

5. All other motions are denied.

Dated: March 2, 2004

THE FOREGOING FACTS WERE FOUND
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER
BY ME AFTER DUE HEARING AND THE
APPROVED AS OF DATE HEARD
FOREGOING ORDER THEREON IS
RECOMMENDED

s"Jeannice M. Reding
s"Bruce A. Peterson
Jeannice M. Reding
Bruce A. Peterson
Referee of District Court
Judge of District Court

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

In Re the Matter of:
Paula Marie Zamzow,
Petitioner,
and
Jeffrey A. Olson, Court File No. DC 216900
Respondent. ORDER

The above-entitled matter came before Referee Jeannice M. Reding on April 27, 2004, for a hearing. Gerald Williams, Esq. appeared on behalf of Petitioner. Respondent appeared pro se. Susan Olson, Guardian ad Litem, also appeared.

Based on the evidence adduced, and all the files, records, and proceedings, the court makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. This matter came on the Respondent's motions to increase visitation time, expand visitation rights, and modify visitation transportation.

2. The respondent seeks to extend his visits from 11 a.m. Saturday until

7 p.m. Saturday. The visits currently are from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. on Saturday.

3. The guardian ad litem does not recommend extended visitation at this time. The minor child is still having some hesitancy with visitation, specifically with spending time alone with the Respondent.

4. The guardian ad litem has recommended that the Respondent engage in reunification therapy with the minor child, with a qualified expert. The guardian ad litem stated that the Petitioner had agreed that the minor child could engage in reunification therapy but that the Respondent had declined to participate.

5. The Respondent indicates at this time that he will engage in reunification therapy and he did not object to a court order for reunification therapy.

6. The Respondent seeks to have his extended family members be present at visitation. The guardian ad litem agreed that it would be acceptable to have a gradual reintroduction of family members.

7. The Court finds that it would not be appropriate to reintroduce a large group of family members to Tyler at this point, as his reunification process with his father has not made as much progress as hoped. After reunification therapy has begun, the Respondent will be allowed to bring one family member to visits to be introduced to the child. The Respondent was encouraged to consult with the reunification therapist and/or the guardian ad litem regarding whether it is appropriate to introduce several family members sequentially or to have one family member get to know Tyler by seeing him more on a regular basis.

8. The Respondent requested that Petitioner assist with the visitation transportation. He has been providing all the transportation for him to make the two hour drive from his home to the Twin Cities three times per month.

9. It is appropriate that the Petitioner provide some assistance with visitation transportation. Therefore, the second visit out of the three visits each month shall be at the Respondent's home in Lake Crystal, Minnesota, with transportation and a visitation supervisor provided by the Petitioner. The visits will continue to take place from 1 to 4 p.m., with the child's transportation times to be arranged outside of the visitation time period.

10. The Respondent's request that his mother be granted his visitation rights should he be unable to see the child because of death or other reasons has no basis in the record and shall be denied.

ORDER

1. The Respondent's visitation time shall continue as previously ordered, except that the second visit of the three monthly visits shall be at the Respondent's home in Lake Crytal, Minnesota. The Petitioner is ordered to provide transportation to and from Respondent's home for the monthly that is to take place at his home and the Petitioner shall provide the supervisor for the visitation time. The visitations shall continue to take place from 1 p.m. Saturday until 4 p.m. Saturday. All travel required for the minor child to go to the Lake Crystal visitation shall take place outside of the time period of 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. Saturday.

2. The Respondent is ordered to engage in reunification therapy with the

minor child. The guardian ad litem shall arrange for the therapy.

3. Once the Respondent begins reunification therapy with the minor child, he may bring one family member to his visitation times with the minor child if he wishes. The Respondent shall consult with the reunificiation therapist and/or the guardian ad litem regarding the best way to introduce family members to the minor child.

4. No sooner than three months from today's date, the Respondent may arrange a telephone conference with the Court to review his visitation times with the minor child. He shall consult with the reunification therapist and the guardian ad litem regarding their recommendations prior to arranging the telephone conference.

5. The Respondent's motion to grant visitation rights to his mother in the event of his death or incapacity is denied.

Reminder: Referee Reding's chambers are at the Hennepin County Government Center, 13th Floor

Dated: April 28, 2004

THE FOREGOING FACTS WERE
FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER
FOUND BY ME AFTER DUE HEARING
APPROVED AS OF DATE HEARD
AND THE FOREGOING ORDER THEREON
IS RECOMMENDED
"sJeannice M. Reding"
"sBruce Peterson"
Jeannice M. Reding Referee of District Court
Bruce A. Peterson Judge of District Court

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT

FOURTH JUDICIAL
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
FAMILY DIVISION

Paula Marie Zamzow
Petitioner/Plaintiff, ORDER
and Court File No. DC 216900
Jeffrey A. Olson,
Respondent/Defendant.

The above-entitled matter came duly before Referee Jeanice M. Reding on May 25, 2004, administratively by letter request of the Guardian ad Litem Program.

Based upon the evidence adduced, the argument of counsel, and all of the files, records, and proceedings herein,

THE COURT FINDS:

1. That the Guardian ad Litem, Susan Olson, is requesting more information regarding the status of the parent involved in the above refernced case.
2. That the Guardian ad Litem requested the parent be evaluated by the Family Court Services psychologist.
3. That this is a reasonable request at this time given the concerns of this case.
4. A current psychological evaluation is necessary for effective reunification therapy to occur.

THE COURT ORDERS:

1. Court Services, complete a psychological evaluation of Mr. Jeffrey Olson, involved in the above case.

THE FOREGOING FACTS WERE FOUND BY ME AFTER DUE HEARING AND THE FOREGOING ORDER THEREON IS RECOMMENDED.

Dated:5/28/04
s"Jeanice M. Reding
Jeanice M. Reding
Referee District Court
Dated:5/28/04
s"Bruce A. Peterson
Bruce A. Peterson
Judge of District Court

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT

FOURTH JUDICIAL
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
FAMILY DIVISION

Paula Marie Zamzow
Petitioner
and
Jeffrey Alan Olson
Respondent.

ORDER
EXTENDED APPOINTMENT
OF GUARDIAN AD LITEM
Court File No. DC216900

The above-entitled matter came duly before Judge Bruce Peterson on June 8, 2004, administratively by request of the Guardian ad Litem Program.

Based upon the evidence adduced, the argument of counsel, and all of the files, records, and proceedings herein,

THE COURT FINDS:

1. That a Guardian ad Litem has been appointed in this case in a previous order dated January 15, 2004.
2. That the involvement of Guardian ad Litem continues to be necessary to advocate for the best interests of the child involved.
3. That this appointment is mandatory.
4. Specifically, the Guardian ad Litem role shall continue due to the long standing differences between the parties and the length of Respondents absence from his son's life and the court's prior order of a Guardian ad Litem.
5. The child's name: Jake Tyler Olson (Tyler) DOB: March 22, 1995.
6. The petitioner's attorney's address is: Gerald Williams, Esq. 905 Parkway Drive, St. Paul, MN. 56055.
7. The parties have the ability to pay fees of the Guardian ad Litem.

THE COURT ORDERS:

1. In accordance with the requirements of Minnesota Statute 518.165, Subd.2 (Required), Susan Olson, Guardian ad Litem,

Family Justice Center, Suite 600, 110 South 4th Street, Minneapolis, MN 55401-2279, telephone number 612-991-6237, is appointed Guardian ad Litem to represent the best interests of the above named child.

2. That the Guardian ad Litem shall have the following authority:

a. The Guardian ad Litem shall be notified of all proceedings. Sanctions may be available upon motion of the Guardian ad Litem.

b. The Guardian ad Litem may initiate and respond to motions, conduct discovery, call and cross-examine witnesses, make oral or written arguments or reports, and appeal on behalf of the children.

c. The Guardian ad Litem shall have the authority to request copies of all pleadings previously submitted by the parties.

d. Parental access shall be as outlined in previous court order. If supervised access is required, the Guardian ad Litem may facilitate or assist the parties or Court Services with arranging or coordinating, for supervision of parenting time between the non-custodial parent and the children. The Guardian ad Litem may select any other qualified person or agency to supervise parenting time as appropriate. The parents are ordered to cooperate with the Guardian ad Litem and with any person or agency chosen by the Guardian Ad Litem to supervise the visitation.

e. The Guardian ad Litem shall make home visits with each party or arrange an opportunity to observe the parent-child interaction.

3. That the Guardian ad Litem shall have access to any Hennepin County Department

of Court Services or Child Protection/child Welfare files or other agencies working with the parties in relation to this case such as Parenting Time Expeditor, parenting consultant or other professional service ordered by the Court without signed releases from the parties. Both agencies and the Guardian ad Litem may mutually and freely exchange any and all information with the Guardian ad Litem regarding the parents and child.

4. That if the parties decline to sign releases of information giving access to the Guardian ad Litem to relevent information not in possession of Hennepin County, the Guardian ad Litem may bring a Motion for appropriate relief and appropriate sanctions.

5. Hennepin County Family Court Services is directed to perform criminal and driving checks on family Court clients when requested by a Hennepin County guardian ad Litem, even if Family Court Services has no open case on the matter. Further, Family Court Services is authorized to provide the results of said checks to the requesting Guardian ad Litem.

6. That, pursuant to this order, no person shall prevent the guardian ad litem from reviewing and recieving copies of all information pertaining to the above named children and the parents or legal guardian of the above named children including medical, psychological and educational data pertinent to the matter before the court.

7. That if the parties come to an agreement, mediated or otherwise, regarding substantive issues surrounding the children, the Guardian ad Litem shall be required to review and sign the agreement before it is presented to the court officer for approval.

8. Within 90 days of this Order, Respondent shall pay $500.00 towards the cost of the Guardian ad Litem servises. Payment of the fees may be made wither by bringing a copy of this Order to the Filing Department on the Public Service Level, 1st floor of the Family Justice Center, and paying the fee in the form of cash, money order or cashiers' check.

Take a copy of the Order on which the receipt of the fee will be printed to the Family Court Guardian ad LitemProgram Office at Suite 600-MC L893, or mailing the payment with a copy of this Order and payment (no personal checks) to the Family Court Guardian ad Litem Program, Family Justice Center, Suite 600-MC L893, 110 S. 4th Street, Minneapolis, MN. 55401-2279. Payment of this judgment may be made through Revenue Recapture and Tax Intercept.

9. The appointment of the Guardian ad Litem shall continue for a period of 12 months from the signature date of this order. The appointment will automatically terminate at that time unless a request is made by the Guardian ad Litem to extend the appointment; a party makes a motion for the same or by other order of the Court.

10. The return date for the hearing regarding the findings of the Guardian ad Litem will be determined at a later date.

Dated:6-10-04 FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER APPROVED AS OF DATE HEARD.

s"Bruce A. Peterson
Bruce A. Peterson
Judge of District Court

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
Guardian ad Litem Program

September 10, 2004
Mr. Jeffrey Olson
380 Bert St.
Lake Crystal, MN 56055
Mr. Olson;
I received your fax dated September 9, 2004. You quoted me as saying things that are unethical, unprofessional and untrue. Your pattern of misquoting and misstating our conversation is unproductive.
In order to facilitate meaningful communication, you may contact me through our legal counsel, Mr. Michael London, Esq. 763-545-1111.
Please do not call me via telephone or attempt to communicate with me via fax.
s"Susan Olson
Susan Olson
Guardian ad Litem

State of Minnesota
District Court Of Minnesota
Fourth Judicial District
Guardian Ad Litem Program

September 10, 2004
Mr. Olson:
Your fax has not been reviewed per my letter to you on September 10, 2004. Please do not fax information to me as it will not be reviewed and it will not be sent back to you.
Mr. Michael London is happy to communicate with you via U.S. mail only.
s"Susan Olson
Susan Olson
Guardian ad Litem

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Jeffrey A. Olson, Civil File No. 04-1082
Plaintiff, (PAM/RLE)
v. ORDER
Bonnie Ellingboe, M.A.,
and McCullough, Smith,
Kempe, Williams & Cyr, P.A.,
Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motions to Dismiss pursuant to Fed R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Plaintiff appeared pro se, and Defendants appeared through counsel. As stated at the hearing, Defendants' Motions are granted and this matter is dismissed with prejudice.

Plaintiff filed a "brief" raising claims under 42 U.S.C. & 1983, alleging that Defendants violated his rights under the Fourth, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Defendants have treated the "brief" as a Complaint, and the Court will do the same. The allegations in the Complaint are difficult to follow, but it appears as though Plaintiff is challenging Defendant Bonnie Ellingboe's psychological evaluation of his child. He contends that a lawyer at Defendant law firm arranged this psycholigical evaluation, without court order, and that as a result of the evaluation, he was precluded from unsupervised visits with his child.

The law firm, McCullough, smith, Kempe, Williams & Cyr, P.A., has moved to dismiss, contending that Plaintiff cannot show that a lawyer was acting under color of state law when he assisted in scheduling the psycholigical evaluation. Defendant Ellingboe has also moved to dismiss, claiming that Plaintiff has failed to make out any violations of his

Constitutional rights, and that Plaintiff has in any case failed to allege that defendant Ellingboe acted under color of state law, as required for a violation of & 1983. Both Defendants contend that Plaintiff's submissions violate Rule 11.

Plaintiff's allegations have no merit and do not raise any violations of his Constitutional rights, nor does Plaintiff ever explain how Defendants were acting under color of state law. Section 1983 applies only to persons acting under color of state law. Thus, Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on which relief can be granted and this matter is dismissed with prejudice.

As noted at the hearing, Plaintiff has previously filed a similar lawsuit in this Court. Judge Kyle sua sponte dismissed that lawsuit with prejudice. Plaintiff has apparently filed numerous lawsuits in state court, because that court has ordered that Plaintiff receive permission of the court before filing further lawsuits there. Given Plaintiff's propensity to repeatedly raise utterly frivolous claims, the Court prior to filing any further lawsuits in this District.

Accordingly, based on the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Clerk Doc. Nos. 4 & 5) are Granted;
2. Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE:
3. Plaintiff may not file any further lawsuits in this District without first receiving permission of the Court to do so.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: June 24, 2004 s/Paul A. Magnuson
Paul A. Magnuson
United States District Court Judge

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

September 1, 2004

Dear Judge Peterson:

Pursuant to your court order dated May 28, 2004, Mr. Jeffrey Alan Olson was interviewed on August 23,2004 for approximately forty minutes by Lawerence Panciera, PH.D., ABPP. In addition to the clinical interview Mr. Olson was administered the Million Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III (MCMI-III) and the Minnesota Multiphasic case.
The following additional information was also reviewed:

1) Responsive Affidavit in support of Motion by Jeffrey Olson dated 18, 2004;

2) Undated letters to Ms. Cardinal, Paula, Tyler, Ms. Reading and Ms. Olson;

3) ParentingTime Evaluation by Gregg Kowalsky dated December3, 2003;

4) Psychological Evaluation by James Gilbertson, Ph.D. dated April 29,1997.

DATA AND REASONING BASIC TO THE OPINIONS
Identifying and Background Information

The Respondent is 34-year old Caucasion-Native American male who is involved in a custody dispute with his wife over the care of their nine year old son. He is from a family of five boys. His parents were divorced when the Respondent was fifteen years of age. He completed high school and entered the Marines. He obtained a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Criminal Justice from Chapman University, located in Orange County, California in 1996, under the auspices of the United States Marine Corps. He received an Honorable Discharge in 1996 with the rank of sergeant. The Respondent

claimed that he had intended to be a career Marine, but that he left the service in order to maintain his relationship with his son. He has worked with the United States Post Office since his retirement from the Marines. He lives in Lake Crystal Minnesota and has a girlfriend. He denies any history of substance abuse or arrest.

When the Respondent related his history and current situation with his ex-wife, the Respondent attributed the source of their problems to his wifeand her family. He viewed his ex-wife as "controlling." He indicated that her family did not approve of his Native American heritage and was undermining his relationship with his ex-wife. He described an encounter with his then wife that took place the night before his wife left with their child. He had returned from thirty-four hours" of continuous duty. She wanted to go to an out door movie. He agreed but indicated that he would have to sleep through the show. She is described as stating that she did not want to go under those conditions. He went to take a bath and she "attacked him." The next day she left with her sister. He commented that "she seemed to have it planned." He described his ex-wifes mother as wanting her daughter near her making her daughter feel guilty for living in California. He indicated that up until the moment that his wife left, he "thought the relationship was really good." He recognized that she was unhappy with his military training, but he told her that he wanted the degree before he left the military. He stated that he does not talk directly to his ex-wife, but must communicate through her family. He believes that she does not support his relationship with his

son.

Dr. Gilbertson noted in his 1997 report on the Respondent that the Respondent's performance on psychological testing was "far in excess of the defensivemess usually encountered." He commented that "The style of his defensiveness is frequently seen in individuals who are self-righteous in view and manner, who have little psycholigical insight and who do not subject their own behavior to critical assessment or monitoring. Their psychological defenses are also seen as relatively brittle and such individuals may lack flexible coping strategies." He further commented "I do not find evidence for antisocial or sociopathic traits. On the contrary, I find evidence for a very sensitive indidvidual who is easily offended, and who generally will not pursue confontation or conflict." He diagnosed the Respondent with "Adjustment Disorder with mixed emotional features" and "Personality showing paranoid and narcissistic traits." The emotional features" and "Personality showing paranoid and narcissistic traits." The Family Court Counselor noted in December of 2003 that the Respondent "did not evidence much understanding or insight about how his past behavior was likely perceived by the Court." This comment referred to a series of motions initiated by the Respondent that led the Judge to prohibit "further motions unless approved by the Court's Chief Judge."

MENTAL STATUS

The Respondent arrived on time for his appointment. He was groomed and appropriately dressed. He demonstrated good eye contact. He was alert and fully oriented. His attention was good. His

concentration was good. He established a socially positive rapport with the interviewer. He was pleasant. His statements were well formed, logically connected and responsive to the questions asked. His manner was matter of fact manner. Memory seemed to be intact. Mood was normal. The Respondent's affect was limited. He was uniformly serious and his demeanor was controlled. There was no evidence of delusions, hallucinations, or disorganized thought.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

The Respondent was administered the Million Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III (MCMI-III). The MCMI-III is a well established objective test of psychological functioning that focuses on the assessment of personality disorders. On the MCMI-III, the Respondent produced a technically valid profile indicating a clear effort to present himself in a positive light and to deny problems. The results that were interpretable are consistent with individuals with the following characteristics. These individuals seek to appear composed, virtuous and mature.

They tend to downplay problems in their personal life. They tend to view themselves as outgoing and sociable. The Respondent was also administered the MMPI-2. The Respondent produced a profile of scores that, again, evidenced an attempt to present himself in a positive light and to deny personal problems. This effort was characterized by unrealistic claims of personal virtue. The pattern of responses is also indicative of a lack of psychological awareness and a rigid approach to life. Individuals with these types of responses on the MMPI-2 also tend to be outgoing, sociable and liking attention.

CLINICAL INTERPRETIVE SUMMARY

There is no evidence that the Respondent experiences an Axis I psychiatric disorder. The manner in which the Respondent discussed his relationship with his ex-wife, the impression he made on the Dr. Gilbertson in 1997 and the Family Court Counselor and the results from the psychological insight into himself and into others. He does not seem able be aware of and have realistic empathy for the psychological state of others. He likely assumes others see the world as he does and he tends to understand the behaviors of others that he finds threatening as caused by ill intention. This is an enduring aspect of his personality. This personality trait seems, however, to have not presented the Respondent with problems in his life except with respect to his relationship with his ex-wife and his current court case. This personality characteristic will potentially impact, to some extent, his relationship with his son and should be kept in mind when evaluating his relationship with his son.

Sincerely yours, s"Lawerence Panciera,
Lawernce Panciera,
Ph.D., ABPP Chief Clinical Psychologist
Licensed Psychologist

STATE OF MINNESOTA DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

In Re the Marriage of:
Paula Marie Zamzow,
Petitioner, Court file No. DC 216900
and ORDER
Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Respondent.

The above-entitled matter came before

the Court on October 18, 2004, for a telephone conference. Gerald Williams, Esq. appeared on behalf of Petitioner, Respondent represented himself and Susan Olson, Guardian ad Litem also appeared.

Based on the evidence adduced, the arguments of counsel, and all the files, records, and proceedings, court makes the following:

ORDER

1. As discussed in the telephone conference, the guardian ad litem will be arranging reunification counseling with Mounds Psychological Services as soon as possible. The Court asked the guardian to inform the Court of the date of the appointment.

2. The guardian ad litem recommended against unsupervised visitation, indicating that the child expresses fear of being alone with his father. Ahe said that this has been confirmed by the childs therapist, and she states that Respondent's parent educator also expressed concerns about unsupervised visitation. The guardian ad litem requested an updated parenting time evaluation, but absent any indication of new developments since the December 2003 evaluation, the request is denied with leave to the guardian to raise the request again if appropriate.

3. A discussion was held about insurance coverage for the reunification therapy. Respondent requested that requested that the therapy proceed with Mounds Psycholigical rather than taking time to ensure that a network provider was used.

4. When the reunification therapist has had an adequate opportunity to work with the parties, and no later than 90 days from the date of this order, the guardian ad litem shall make a written

recommendation to the Court for a parenting schedule.
Reminder: Judge Peterson's chambers remain at the Hennepin County Government Center, 13th Floor, Room 1324.
Dated: 10-19-04 BY THE COURT:
s"Bruce A. Peterson
Bruce A. Peterson
Judge of District Court

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA
GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROGRAM

December 10, 2004
Judge Bruce Peterson
Hennepin County Government Center
300 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
Court File: Olson & Zamzow
DC216900
Child: Tyler Olson
DOB: 3?22/95

Your Honor:
As I will be unavailable for the scheduled phone conference on Monday, December 13, 2004, I would like to bring you up to date on my efforts regarding the above named child. Mr. Steve Zamzow has been providing regular, onsistant supervision during Mr. Olson's parenting time. Mr. Zamzow fills out a Hennepin County report form and sends it to me three times each month. I have kept all of the report forms.
Mr. Zamzow brings Tyler to meet Mr. Olson in the metro area twice each month and he drives to Lake Crystal with Tyler once each month so that Mr. Olson can have parenting time in his home. Mr. Olson has had regular, consistent parenting time with Tyler three Saturdays each month. In September, 2004, Mr. Zamzow became ill and was unable to transport Tyler

to Lake Crystal. Ms. Zamzow was highly anxious about the cancellation and was fearful of sanctions should Tyler miss a visit.

Ms. Zamzow made extraordinary efforts to find a replacement supervisor among her group of friends and church members. I had multiple phone contacts with Ms. Zamzow as she struggled to locate a visitation supervisor. She was unsuccessful in finding someone willing to drive to Lake Crystal on a moment's notice and I recommended canceling the visit. I called Mr. Olson to let him know the visit would be cancelled due to Steve's illness.

Ms. Zamzow, Tyler and Steve Zamzow have been extraordinarily cooperative considering the significant amount of chaos by Mr. Olson's written communications and accusations. Ms. Zamzow accommodated Mr. Olson with an additional visit in May when Mr. Olson planned a trip which conflicted with his parenting time. Mr. Olson did not recprocate with the same understanding or consideration when Ms. Zamzow went on vacation for three weeks to New York.

In November, Mr. Olson wrote a letter in which he described Mr. Zamzow as nearly explosive with anger and unreasonably harsh with Tyler. I called Mr. Zamzow immediately and asked him to describe in detail the Saturday visit. Mr. Zamzow was confused and very disappointed to learn of Mr. OLson's accusation. Mr. Zamzow stated, "I'm surprised how well the visitation has gone considering all the stuff he does to my sister Paula. They have gone well. I don't know why he would sabotage them." Mr. Zamzow has looked positively on the supervisor role. Mr. Zamzow stated to me on an earlier

occasion that that he enjoyed being with his nephew and he had the ability to get along with Mr. Olson. The accusation by Mr. Olson was vehemently denied by Mr. Zamzow and he stated he would no longer be comfortable in the role as visitation supervisor.

Pursuant to the Order appointing a Guardian ad Litem dated August, 2003, I determined the need to make alternative arrangements for the supervised access. I asked Mr. Olson(letter dated November 17, 2004) to locate a suitable replacement or use a visitation center. Mr. Olson replied with a letter with references to a "federal Case" which I am unaware of. He made no effort to identify a suitable replacement for Mr. Zamzow and he has not contacted a visitation center. Mr. Olson was informed as to the reason Mr. Zamzow withdrew as supervisor as how he could go about having continued supervised visitation.

Mr. Olson has alienated Mr. Zamzow who was cooperative and a much needed supportive family member for Tyler in this process. This cooperation is well documented.

As for any perceived delays in this process. The effort to establish reunification therapy for Mr. Olson was strongly thwarted by Mr. Olson himself beginning early last spring. He appears to be cooperating & out of options at this point. I have been in contact with Dr. Brian Powers, therapist for Mr. Olson and Tyler. This therapy will continue with the full cooperation of Ms. Zamzow.

Ms. Zamzow, along with her counsel, has been instrumental in ensuring Tyler has consistent, regular contact with Mr. Olson. Ms. Zamzow has never once interfered with visitation and in fact becomes distraught

at the thought of doing anything outside the Orders of this Court. I encouraged Ms. Zamzow to continue to give Tyler "permission" to enjoy the time he spends with his dad.

In my interviews with Tyler and his former therapist, I have never seen any evidence that Ms. Zamzow has negatively influenced Tyler with regard to his father. This is a clear indication that Ms. Zamzow has placed the needs of her son ahead of her own needs, fear and distress.

I strongly believe that Mr. Olson's contact with his son should be limited to a therapeutic setting until such time that Mr. Olson's therapist would suggest an expanded access schedule. Mr. Olson's relentless, unfounded accusations against Mr. Steve Zamzow and Ms. Zamzow have a negative impact on Tyler as they negatively impact Tyler's family.

I believe it is in Tyler Olson's best interest to have his needs placed ahead of the needs of his father. Mr. Olson has not acknowledged how his behavior is negatively impacting his son. He lacks understanding as to how his six year absence may have interfered with the father and son relationship. Mr. Olson lacks insight into his behavior and he lacks empathy for his son.

I respectfully make the following recommendations which I believe are in Tyler's best interest.

1. Supervised visitation is suspended.
2. Contact between father and son is limited to a one hour therapeutic session.
3. Tyler continues in individual therapy.
4. Ms. Zamzow continue in individual therapy and fully cooperate with Dr. Powers during the reunification process.

5. Mr. Olson fully cooperate with DR. Powers, following all recommendations.
S" Susan Olson
Susan Olson
Guardian ad Litem

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Jeffrey Alan Olson, JUDGMENT IN
V. A CIVIL CASE
Gerald O. Williams,
et al., Case No. 04-5052 RHK/JSM

This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:
The Complaint in the above entitled matter fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, said Complaint is DISMISSED WITHOU PREJUDICE.
Date December 28, 2004 Richard D. Sletten, Clerk
s"Lisa Duda
Lisa Duda, Deputy Clerk

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
GUARDIAN AD LITEM PROGRAM

Court File: Olson & Zamzow DC216900
Child: Tyler Olson DOB: 3/22/95
February 9, 2005
Your Honor:
This letter is an up-date on the progress to date regarding the reunification therapy between Mr. Jeffrey Olson & Tyler Olson. I met with Tyler on Saturday, February 5, 2005. Tyler demonstrates an improved level of comfort in talking about his father and the time they spend together. Tyler states he is pleased with Dr. Brian Powers and the therapy sessions. Tyler

was able to tell me a few pieces of information about his father which he was never able to do in the past. He knows what his dad does for a living and he knows about a few of his hobbies.
He has seen some photos of Mr. Olson's family members.
Mr. Olson continues to spend significant time & energy generating legal action which is distressing to Ms. Zamzow and therefore distressing to Tyler.
Of concern is Tyler's (limited) knowledge about problems between Ms. Zamzow and Mr. Olson. He recalls his father discussing "court stuff" with his uncle during visits and he is well aware that correspondence generated by Mr. Olson frequently arrives at their home.
He is well aware that this mail is distressing to his Mom. Ms. Zamzow & I have discussed the importance of keeping adult information from Tyler. Ms. Zamzow agrees that it is in Tyler's best interest to develope a relationship with his father that is seperate from the negative relationship which has developed between the parents.
After discussion with Dr. Powers, Mr. Olson, myself and Ms. Zamzow. Ms. Zamzow agreed to the meeting and it is tentatively set for Thursday, February 17, 2005.
I will participate in my role as Guardian ad Litem for Tyler.
The purpose of the meeting is to discuss expanded parenting time for expanded parenting time for Mr. Olson, well, with the goal of expanding time within the month following our meeting. Another goal is to increase confidence building measures.
Dr. Powers reports Mr. Olson has not givenany signs of being un-cooperative with therapy and he clearly enjoys the

time he is able to spend with Tyler. Dr. Powers will be discussing and recommending an expanded schedule which will re-instate supervised visitation with the goal of expanding to unsupervised time for Mr. Olson and Tyler.
In light of what appears to be unprecedented progress in this case, I find Mr. Olson's legal actions inconsistent with sincere cooperation in reunification therapy. It is in Tyler's best interest to have his father fully and sincerely engaged in this therapy.
Ms. Zamzow is aware that she cannot disguise all her anxiety with regard to this process. She remains fully cooperative with the reunification process and she & Tyler are currently engaged in individual therapy (seperate therapists).
s"Susan Olson
Susan Olson
Guardian ad Litem

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2732	*APPEAL FROM THE
Jeffrey A. Olson,	*District Court
Appellant,	*For the District
v.	*of Minnesota
Bonnie Ellingboe;	*
McCullough, Smith,	*
Kempe, Williams & Cyr,	*
P.A.,	*
Appellees.	*

JUDGEMENT

This appeal from the United States District Court was submitted on the record of the district court and the briefs of the parties. After consideration, it is hereby ordered and adjudged that the

judgment of the district court in this cause is affirmed in accordance with the opinion of this court.

The district Court's injunction prohibiting appellant Jeffrey A. Olson from filing any further lawsuits in the district court without first receiving permission from the district court to do so is hereby modified to prohibit appellant, without first obtaining leave of court, from filing any further lawsuits in the district court when those lawsuits involve matters related to his state-court custody and divorce proceedings.

(5361-010199)

January 25, 2005

Order entered at the Direction of the Court

s" Michael E. Gans
Michael E. Gans

Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1284

Jeffrey Alan Olson, Appellant,
V.
Gerald O. Williams, attorney at law;
Kevin S. Burke, Honorable Chief Judge,
James M. Rosenbaum, Honorable Chief Judge,
United States District Court;
William H. Rehnquist, Honorable Chief Judge,
Appellees.

*Appeal from the United
*States District Court
*for the District
*of Minnesota
*

Before BYE, RILEY, & COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.

Filed: May 9, 2005.

PER CURIAM.
Jeffrey A. Olson appeals the district court's dismissal of his civil complaint for failure to state a claim. After denovo review, we conclude a dismissal was proper. See Smith v. Boyd945 F. 2d 1041, 1042-43 (8th Cir. 1991), Accordingly , we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47 B.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA
GUARDIAN AD LITEM
REPORT

July 31,2005
Zamzow (FKA Olson) & Olson
DC 216900
Guardian ad Litem Appointment Date:
Mandatory appointment August 8, 2003
(Jacqueline Cardinal was original GAL)
Susan Olson January 15, 2004. Appointment expired June 8, 2005.
Guardian ad Litem Role Specific to Case:
Act in the best interest of the child and report on the interactions between respondent and child.
Child: Jake "Tyler" Olson
Personal Contacts Made:
Ms. Zamzow
Mr. Olson
Tyler Olson
Steve Zamzow
Collateral Contacts Made:
Jackie Cardinal GAL
Greg Kowalsky, Parenting Time Evaluator
Bonnie Ellingbow, Tyler's therapist 2004
Bill Gundlock, Parenting Consultant for Mr. Olson (church friend Ms. Zamzow)
Dr. Brian Powers, Therapist for Mr. Olson and Tyler
Dr. Pansiera, Hennepin County Psychological Services
Wendy Mattera, Parenting Consultant & visitation supervisor for Mr. Olson and

Collateral Information:
GAL Case File
Psychological Evaluation for Mr. Olson (1997)
Parenting Time Study
Psychological Evaluation for Mr. Olson (2004)

CURRENT CUSTODY AND PARENTING TIME ACCESS:

Ms. Zamzow has sole legal and sole physical custody of Tyler Olson. Tyler is 10 years old and lives with his mother and sister in a single family home. Mallory Zamzow is the daughter of Ms. Zamzow and was the step-daughter of Mr. Olson. Mr. Olson's motion for joint legal and physical custody of Mallory Zamzow was denied in a Court Order dated March2, 2004. He was also denied any parenting time with Mallory.

Mr. Olson had his parenting time with Tyler suspended and was denied in bringing further motions without the permission of, then Chief Judge Daniel Mabley in a Court Order dated July 28, 1998 by Judge Duffy.

Mr. Olson was allowed to bring a motion for parenting time in July, 2003.

Mr. Olson withdrew from the reunification process in March, 2005. Prior to his withdrawal, Mr. Olson was Court Ordered to participate in reunification therapy with Dr. Brian Powers.

OBSERVATIONS:

In addition to the previous letters as as oral reports to The Court I observed the following:

I last met with Tyler in February in 2005. Tyler has been consistent in his desire to have another person present when he spends time with his father. Tyler indicated he was afraid to be alone with his dad and would want to have Uncle Steve or another person present. I

attribute Tyler's reluctance to a very reasonable estrangement between father and son. Mr. Olson had a self imposed six year absence from his son and his behavior since July, 2003 has been problematic for the family.

Tyler is a shy and sensitive child who appeared ambivalent about spending time with his father. Tyler expressed objection to spending three of every four Saturdays with his father because he would rather be with friends. Tyler is at the age where children begin to view peer relationships with greater importance. Tyler has experienced somatic symptoms associated with parenting time. He had some episodes of bed wetting which ended many months ago. Since Mr. Olson's withdrawal in March 2005, Ms. Zamzow reports Tyler wakes-up fearful during the nights.

Under close scrutiny, Mr. Olson was able to interact with Tyler in an appropriate manner. His writings and his actions however are inconsistent with his stated desire to have a father-son relationship with Tyler. Mr. Olson has alienated all those who have attempted to help him work, well, toward reunification. Mr. Olson's actions and behavior are similiar to those he displayed in 1998.

In my opinion, Mr. Olson has a consistent practice of making wildly false accusations as, well as veiled threats against family members and court professionals alike. This personality trait as well as Mr. Olson's behavior was predicted in two psychological evaluations. To my knowledge, Mr. Olson is not now and has never received psycholgical intervention for this difficult and enduring aspect of his personality.

As stated in my previous letters as well

as in oral reports to the Court, Ms. Zamzow has never interfered with the process of reunification. Ms. Zamzow did express fear and concern about Mr. Olson's ability to behave appropriately with Tyler. I believe this fear and concern is well founded after my review of his own writings and motions.

After many stalled efforts to move forward toward unsupervised parenting time, Mr. Olson agreed to cooperate with reunification therapy. Dr. Powers reunification therapy. Dr. Powers (reunification therapist) first met with Mr. Olson in December 2004. In January, 2005, Dr. Powers reported four meetings with Tyler and Mr. Olson had gone well. Tyler was "fairly comfortable" with his dad. Dr. Powers indicated he would spend "private time" with Mr. Olson to give him parenting pointers. Dr. Powers went on to say that he can't predict what Mr. Olson would do if he wasn't supervised and that it would take more time to form an opinion about this. Dr. Powers stated he explained to Mr. Olson that Ms. Zamzow was not obstructing the visits and had in fact gone way out of her way to accomodate his work schedule.

I spoke with Tyler's therapist on January 13, 2005. She was fully supportive of the therapeutic setting for Tyler and his dad and she believed this would benefit Tyler.

On January 31, 2005 I spoke with Dr. Powers. He stated Mr. Olson and Tyler were doing well in therapy. He gave Jeff "all A's" with Tyler.

On February 17, 2005, I met with Dr. Brian Powers, Mr. Olson and Ms. Zamzow. At that meeting, Dr. Powers explained that he would meet with Mr. Olson for a "trial" of supervised contact in public places.

Dr Powers stated Tyler would not be comfortable with unsupervised contact. Dr. Powers would also continue to meet 1 on 1 with Mr. Olson. Dr. Powers also stated his goal was to give Mr. Olson more opportunity to demonstrate a good relationship with Tyler.
After those goals were met, the next step was to have Wendy Mattera, Parenting consultant, provider visitation supervision. Ms. Mattera would also assess the quality of relationship between Mr. Olson and Tyler and provide parenting coaching as well.
I spoke with Mr. Olson on March 29, 2005. During that conversation he indicated he believed Tyler was being influenced by his Mom and she was "using" Tyler. He was upset that Ms. Zamzow would pick up Tyler from therapy and "leave as quickly as possible." He stated he did not want to pay $150.00 per visit for Wendy Mattera's services. I told Mr. Olson I would contact Dr. Powers for an update. Mr. Olson did not mention that he had cancelled his appointments without explanationand was not returning calls from Dr. Powers.
On April 20, 2005, I spoke with Dr. Powers. He indicated reunification therapy was going well until he received a "bizarre" letter from Mr. Olson. Dr. Powers stated his last contact with Mr. Olson was the middle of March. He stated he believed they were "done" working together. Mr. Olson had simply called and cancelled the last appointment without explanation. Mr. Olson had refused to return any calls from Dr. Powers.
Dr. Powers stated his original goal was reunification which he believed would not happen under the current circumstances. Dr. Powers stated Mr. Olson would not

cooperate and would not communicate with him. Dr. Powers stated he was far more concerned about Mr. Olson than he was at the start of the process. Dr. Powers stated that reunification will not be possible unless Mr. Olson seeks help from a psychiatric professional who can do more for him than he (Dr. Powers) can. Dr. Powers met one additional time with Tyler in order to assess his adjustment to the change of circumstance.

I spoke with Ms. Zamzow about last visit between Tyler and his father. She stated Tyler met with his Dad and Wendy Mattera on March 12, 2005. She said they went bowling and went to Culvers and everything was fine. Ms. Zamzow stated that on March 19, 2005, Wendy Mattera called and said Jeff Olson cancelled at the last minute with no explanation.

Ms. Zamzow stated, "I feel sorry for Tyler. You want him to have a nice dad...I prayed Jeff would change...I feel so bad for Tyler."

I spoke with Dr. Powers again on July 11, 2005. He stated his recommendations as follows, "I don't believe Tyler would be physically harmed by Jeff but we cannot predict what he will say or do. This is psychologically damaging to Tyler. I recommend no contact until he "honestly" completes a psychological assessment and works with a therapist to address the paranoid part and perhaps the dissociative part where one part of personality does not communicate with the other part."

SUMMARY:

There is far more information in the Court File than can be included in this report. This case has consumed an extraordinary amount of time, energy and resources from the family as well as the professionals involved. Much of the now wasted effort

has been at Tyler's expense.
Mr. Olson is exhibiting the same unchanged behavior that caused the suspension of his parenting time in 1998. Mr. Olson's withdrawal from the reunification process is one more example of how his instability as well as his personality characteristics has harmed Tyler.
Not to be overlooked is the Court Finding (July 29, 1998) credible evidence that Mr. Olson abused Ms. Zamzow during their marriage.
Many of the professionals involved attempted to explain to Mr. Olson how his six year absence from Tyler's life would require him to be patient and allow Tyler to feel safe and comfortable with him.
Some of the enduring aspects of Mr. Olson's personality as well as his unmoderated behavior cause great concern when considering unsupervised access with Tyler.
Extraordinary time and effort has been exhausted in an attempt to reunify Tyler with his father. Mr. Olson made the unilateral decision to withdraw from the process without explanation. At this time Mr. Olson is unable or unwilling to cooperate fully and sincerely with the reunification process.
Tyler's greatest needs are stability, safety and security. Ms. Zamzow provides these for him. Ms. Zamzow has not disparaged Mr. Olson to Tyler and thus has left the door open for a future relationship which can happen on Tyler's terms when he is mature and can form his own opinions about each parent.
RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. Mr. Olson's parenting time be suspected until he is in an established therapeutic relationship with a psychiatrist. This therapy occur prior to Mr. Olson making

further motions for parenting time with Tyler.
2. Tyler continue to work with his individual therapist to address this most recent withdrawal by Mr. Olson.
3. Tyler's desire for a relationship with Mr. Olson be fully explored with a therapist prior to the court ordering any contact.
s"Susan Olson
Susan Olson
Guardian ad Litem

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DISTRICT COURT

FOURTH JUDICIAL
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
FAMILY DIVISION

Paula Marie Zamzow
Petitioner

and

Jeffrey Alan Olson
Respondent.

ORDER

Court File No. DC216900

This Matter came before the Honorable Daniel H. Mabley for hearing on August 24, 2005 upon Respondent's motion for modification of custody.
Appearances:
Gerald O. Williams, Jr. Esq., appeared for Petitioner herein.
Respondent appeared pro se.
THE COURT FINDS:
1. Respondent has requested custody of the parties' son, Jake "Tyler" Olson, as well as Petitioner's daughter Mallory (of whom Respondent is the former stepfather).
2. By order dated March 2, 2004, this court made findings, among others, that the Judgment and Decree in this matter did not grant Respondent any rights to visitation with Mallory; that Respondent had not seen Mallory in over six years;

and that Respondent did not establish a basis under Minn. Stat. &257C.08, subd. 4 for visitation with Mallory.

3. Respondent's motion documents do nothing to establish Respondent's right to legal custody, physical custody or visitation (parenting time) with Mallory, and constitute a frivolous motion to this court that has unreasonably contributed to the length and expense of these proceedings.

4. Pursuant to Minn. Stat &518.18(d), a party seeking modification of custody must establish four elements. Respondent's motion papers fail to even allege a prima facie case for custody modification based on these four elements; namely,

a. Respondent failed to allege any facts in his petition that even suggest there has been a change in circumstances since the last custody order. To the contrary, the Guardian ad Litem summarized that Respondent is exhibiting the same unchanged behavior that caused suspension of his parenting time in 1998 and a current suspension of his parenting time is warrented.

b. Respondent failed to allege any facts in his petition as to how a modification of custody would serve the best interests of the child. To the contrary, the Guardian ad Litem, along with other professionals involved have expended an extraordinary amount of time, energy and resources with the family to facilitate reunification. Many professionals involved have attempted to explain to Respondent that after a six year absence from Tyler Olson's life, reunification would be a slow process. Respondent has since voluntarily withdrawn from the reunification process.

c. Respondent failed to allege any

facts in his petition as to how the present environment of the child with his mother, Petitioner, endangers the physical or emotional health or impairs the emotional development of the minor child. Tothe contrary, the Guardian ad Litem has stated that Petitioner can provide Tyler Olson his greatest needs; stability, safety and security. Furthermore, based on the Respondent's current conduct, any parenting time between Respondent and the child will be detrimental at this time.

d. Respondent failed to allege any facts in his petition as to how the advantages of modification outweight the harm caused by the change in custody.

5. Respondent's limitations placed on his right to parenting access time with Tyler Olson were due to his own inability to cooperate with the reunification process and not due to Petitioner's conduct. Respondent's parenting time was previously suspended and conditions were placed on Respondent to ensure reunification, acting in the best interests of the child. Respondent voluntarily withdrew from the reunification process prematurely, despite efforts from professionals involved. Petitioner's conduct was consistent and cooperative with the requirements of reunification.

6. Respondent's request for custody of Tyler Olson-when viewed in light of Respondent's failure to cooperate with the efforts of the Guardian ad Litem, the reunification therapist, Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel in providing a process for Respondent's reunification with Tyler-is equally frivolous.

7. On July 29, 1998, the Honorable David Duffy issued an order in this case that Respondent should:

bring no further motions before this

Court except by first appearing before the Chief Judge of Hennepin county District Court to establish probable cause for the relief requested. (page 7, Paragraph 2.)

8. The court found such a sanction to be justified because of Respondent's numerous and duplicative motions and papers, and because of his many incredible legal theories and claims-none of which [had] been found by this Court to have any merit. (Page 7, Paragraph 2.)

9. Respondent's former counsel of record withdrew on October 6, 2003. Since that time, Respondent has filed with the court, or the court has been copied on, numerous motions and papers that are again duplicative and devoid of merit.

10. The Order of July 29, 1998 remains in effect and based upon Respondent's conduct recently, it is necessary to enforce the order and require the Respondent to obtain leave from the Chief Judge of District Court prior to filing future motions.

11. In this Court's order dated July 5, 2003, the court entered judgment against Respondent, in favor of Petitioner's deceased mother, in the amount of $6500. In that order, on page 3, paragraph 11, the court recognized that Respondent had affirmed this debt (and another that has since been extinguished) and that the parties worked out a payment schedule for the extinguishment of the debts. The payment schedule was a lump sum payment of $2500, and monthly payments of $200 thereafter.

12. Respondent has ceased making the $200 monthly payments. More than half of the $6500 judgment is still unpaid, and the $984 attorney fee award is completely unpaid. Petitioner has requested that

Respondent continue the $200 monthly payments, above and beyond his child support obligations.

13.Since the summer of 2003, when Respondent reinstituted post-decree proceedings in this matter, Petitioner has incurred through June 30, 2005 attorney's fees totaling $19,074; expenses of $552.04; advances of $155.00; and finance charges of $223.01 Since July 1, 2005, Petitioner has incurred attorney's fees and costs exceeding $1600.

14. Respondent has unreasonably and substantially contributed to the length and expense of these proceedings.

15. In March 2004, the court ordered Respondent to pay $984.00 towards Petitioner's attorney's fees and costs, which Respondent has not paid.

16. Petitioner has requested that Respondent reimburse her only a portion of the attorney's fees (15,000) necessitated by Respondent's conduct. Petitioner will still owe in excess of $6650 in attorney's fees and costs for which she is not seeking reimbursement.

17. But for Respondent's conduct, Petitioner would have incurred a small fraction of the attorney's fees and costs she incurred in this matter. Respondent's failure to follow through on the reunification process is not the fault of Petitioner's attorney, the Guardian ad Litem, or the reunification therapist. It is Respondent's responsibility.

18. The court considers it a fair allocation of responsibility of Petitioner's attorney's fees and costs that Respondent would owe Petitioner reimbursement in the amount of $15,000.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Respondent's motion for modification of custody of the minor children is hereby

denied.
2. The order of this court dated July 29, 1998, whereby Respondent is precluded from bringing further motions before this Court except upon first appearing before the Chief Judge of Hennepin County District Court to establish probable cause for the relief requested is extended and shall continue until further order of the court.
3. Respondent shall continue payments of at least $200 per month-above and beyond Respondent's child support, child care contributions, the minor child's health expenses, and Respondent's other expenses that pertain to the child-towards the judgments against Respondent in favor of Petitioner, Petitioner's mother and/or Petitioner's attorney.
4. Petitioner shall have and recover judgment against Respondent in the amount of $15,000 for attorney's fees and costs in this matter.
5. Service of this Order may be made by United States mail and the same shall be in lieu of and effective as personal service.
Dated: 9-2-05 s"Daniel H. Mabley
Daniel H. Mabley
Judge of District Court
Family Court Division

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA
Civil No: 05-190 (MJD/JGL)

Jeffrey Alan Olson, Plaintiff,

v.

Gerald Williams, ET AL., Defendants.

ORDER

Pursuant to Judge Paul Magnuson's order of June 24, 2004, barring Plaintiff from filing complaints without permission of the Court, the Complaint is Hereby

Dismissed without Prejudice.
Dated: February 2, 2005
s/ Michael J. Davis
Michael J. Davis
United States District Court Judge

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT
No. 05-1615

Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Appellant,
V.
Gerald O. Williams,
Attorney at Law;
United States Senate;
United States Congress;
Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Submitted: October 7, 2005
Filed: October 20, 2005

Before Bye, McMillian, & Riley, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Jeffrey Olson appeals the district courts dismissal of his complaint. We agree with the district court that Olson failed to comply with an earlier district court order prohibiting him from filing specified complaints prior to receiving permission to do so.

The Honorable Michael J. Davis, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

NO.05-1615

Jeffrey Alan Olson,
Appellant,
vs.

*Appeal from
*the United States
*District Court

Gerald O. Williams, Attorney at Law; United States Senate; United States Congress, Appellees. *for the District *of Minnesota

---

The petition for rehearing by the panel filed by appelant is denied.
(5193-010199)
December 22, 2005
Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
s"Michael E. Gans
Michael E. Gans
Clerk, U.S. Court of appeals, Eighth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Re: 05-1615 Jeffrey Alan Olson vs. Gerald O. Williams
Dear Mr. Olson:

We are returning your "Amended Notice of Appeal En Banc." On December 22, 2005, the court denied your petition for rehearing. This case has been closed and mandated and we no longer have jurisdiction to in this matter.

You have 90 days from the date your rehearing was denied to file a petition for writ of certiorari with the United States Supreme Court. I would suggest you contact the Supreme Court at the following address as soon as possible regarding their procedures.

William K. Suter, Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
One-First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

Sincerely s"Michael E. Gans
Michael E. Gans
Clerk of Court
CIV 05-190 MJD/JGL